THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

BY GREGORY ALASTRUEY

TRANSLATED BY

Sister 5W. *Janet La Çfylia, O. P.*

VOLUME TWO

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

y Madrid, 3rd edition, 1952·

^TOMATTO-HoscphCordinol Ritter
Archbishop of St. Louis. FebTOrp 4. 1964

Copyright © 1964 by B. Herder Book Co.
15 & 17 South Broadway, St. Louis 2, Mo.
London: 2/3 Doughty Mews, W.C. 1
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 63-13532
Manufactured in the United States of America
Designed by Klaus Gemming

CONTENTS

Chapter One : Mary's Cooperation in General

Chapter Two : Mary's Cooperation in Objective Redemption

Cooperation in Redemption in General, 8
Cooperation in Redemption in Particular, 24

Chapter Three : Mary's Cooperation in Subjective Redemption

Mary's Cooperation in the Distribution of Graces, -β
Mary's Causality in the Distribution of Graces, 87
Special Graces Distributed Through Mary's Intervention, 96

Chapter Four : Titles Derived from Mary's Cooperation

Mediatrix, 130
Co-Redemptrix, 138
Mother of Men, 146
Advocate and Patroness of the Human Race, 158
Queen and Lady, 184

Chapter Five : Veneration of Mary

Lawfulness of Veneration of Mary, 204
Devotion to the Immaculate Heart, 211
Veneration of Relics and Images of Mary, 215

Chapter Six : Elements of the Cult of Mary

Cult of Honor, 229
Cult of Invocation, 232
Cult of Imitation, 236

Chapter Seven : Necessity of Devotion to Mary

Marian Devotion and Salvation, 240
Benefits of Devotion to Mary, 248

Chapter Eight : Origin and Antiquity of Marian Devotion

CONTENTS

Chapter Nine : Practices of Marian Devotion

The Marian Scapular, **272**

The Rosary, ζηη

translator's bibliography, **286**

NOTES, 287

INDEX, 309

CHAPTER ONE

TAary s Cooperation in Qeneral

*

have studied Mary's divine maternity and all the gifts and privileges that flow from it. We now proceed to examine her admirable and mysterious cooperation in the work of human redemption. Cooperation here signifies Mary's union or association with Christ, but always dependent upon Him, in the work of redemption or the restoration of the human race to the supernatural order. Mary's association with Christ is not necessarily restricted to one single mode of cooperation in that work, but it admits of various modes. We shall consider Mary's cooperation under four aspects: her cooperation with Christ in the work of redemption in general, her cooperation in *objective* redemption, her cooperation in *subjective* redemption, and the titles and offices derived from her association with Christ.

thesis: *Mary was Christ's consort in the work of redemption.*

Although some theologians have denied Mary's cooperation under certain particular aspects, there is no controversy whatever concerning her cooperation in general. After the divine maternity, it is so fundamental and certain that it pertains to the deposit of revelation.

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Leo XIII said: "And truly, the Immaculate Virgin, chosen to be the Mother of God and thereby associated with Him in the work of man's salvation, has a favor and power with her Son greater than any human or angelic creature has ever obtained or ever can gain."[1]

In another place he states: "Mary, with the ever merciful affection so characteristic of her maternal heart, wishes, through her efficacious intercession with God, to deliver her children from the sad and grief-laden troubles, from the tribulations, the anxiety, the difficulties, and the punishments of God's anger." * This affirmation he repeats in another document: "For no single individual can even be imagined

who lias ever contributed or ever will contribute so much toward reconciling man with God." [8]

St. Pius X stated that she surpassed all in holiness and union with Christ and was associated with Christ in the work of redemption.[4] Pope Pius XI tells us that the Virgin, conceived without sin, was chosen as the Mother of God precisely as His associate in the work of human redemption. Many other pontifical documents, which we will quote frequently, may be added to these.

Sacred Scripture. "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed. She shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel" (Gen. 3:15). Here Mary is associated with Christ in the enmities and combats against the devil and in the complete victory over him. Now victory over Satan, in the present order of providence, is none other than the fulfillment of human redemption, or the liberation of man from sin, by which he had become a slave to Satan, and the restoration to his primitive state of friendship with God.

Pope Pius IX explains this association of Mary with Christ in redemption, as stated in the verse from Genesis: "Bound to Him by the closest and most indissoluble bond, the most holy Virgin carries into effect, together with Him and by Him, the perpetual enmities against the poisonous serpent, is completely victorious over it, and crushes it by her immaculate foot." [6]

However, Father Marlaskaj, O.F.M., seems to infer that Mary's only triumph was her immunity from original sin. He distinguishes a double triumph in the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus:* the one, proper to Christ, by which Christ, in blotting out the deed of the decree against us, nailed it triumphantly on the Cross; the other, common to Christ and Mary, in which the Blessed Virgin, united to Christ by an indissoluble bond, crushed the head of the serpent with her immaculate foot.

It is certain that the immaculate conception of Mary contains a great victory over the devil, but her immaculate conception is only the first victory, necessary for those which were to follow. The Bull *Ineffabilis* declares that Genesis clearly and distinctly refers to the merciful Redeemer of the human race in the person of the only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, and designates the most blessed

Virgin Mary as His Mother. It also refers to the enmities of both against the devil.

But if the enmities of Christ and Mary with Satan are the same, and therefore one and the same battle was to produce the same victory, it is clear that Mary is there represented as a consort of Christ, singularly united to Him both in combat and in victory over the enemy. Therefore, if Christ's victory consisted in the redemption of men and in the restoration of the work of God destroyed through sin, Mary must have cooperated with her Son in the accomplishment of the work of redemption.

Fathers and Doctors of the Church. The comparison of Mary with Eve is generally accepted by the Fathers, so that the part Eve played with Adam in the fall of the human race is assigned to Mary, together with Christ, in the work of redemption. Thus, as Eve was Adam's consort in our fall, so Mary was Christ's in the work of our redemption.

The Fathers and Doctors frequently call Christ the Bridegroom of Mary and unite her to Him as spouse and cooperator in the work of salvation. Thus, St. Ephrem makes Mary speak to her newly bom Son, in this way: "I am your sister, since David is father of us both; I am your mother because I conceived you in my womb; I am your spouse through the sanctity I received from you." · St. Peter Chrysologus says: "A speedy messenger (Gabriel) flies to the bride to take from the bride of God the inclination to human marriage, not to take the Virgin away from Joseph, but to give her to Christ to whom she was pledged when He became incarnate in her womb."[7]

Basil of Seleucia (Or. 3), St. Albert the Great *(Mariale,* q. 29) and St. Bonaventure (Serm. 1 and 6, *In Assumpt.)* use similar expressions. Fulbert of Chartres says that she alone merited to be called mother and spouse, who repaired the injury of the first mother and brought redemption to fallen man.[8]

The Liturgy. The liturgy also gives Mary a place in the work of redemption. Thus, in the Greek calendars we read: "Through you we have been redeemed from the malediction which fell upon our first parents." The Ambrosian Missal states: "What Eve destroyed by her sin, Mary restored in redemption. There is a great distance between the work of the serpent and the work of Man·." The Missal

of Westminster declares: "She repaired the injury of our first mother; she brought redemption to fallen mankind." 0

Theological Argument. Although the reason for Mary's association with Christ in the work of human redemption can be none other than God's will, who thus disposed it, we may nevertheless infer this argument of convenience: Both sexes had to concur in the salvation of mankind, since both had been the cause of its fall. So St. Bernard says: "It was more fitting that both sexes should cooperate in our reparation since neither one was free of corruption." 10

thesis: *The relationship between Mary's maternity, the work of redemption and her association in the work of redemption.*

It is certain that the divine maternity and her association in the work of redemption are not two concepts which naturally and mutually include each other. According to the present order of providence, in which the Incarnation was decreed and destined for the work of human redemption as its principal end (uniquely or not, according to the twofold opinion of theologians on this subject), we may affirm the following:

i) If the association in redemption is understood in a broad sense, as a remote cooperation in the work of redemption through the merely physical maternity of Mary, then the divine maternity and association in the redemption are two concepts which cannot be separated from each other.

2) If the association is understood as a remote or proximate cooperation, by means of moral acts previous or subsequent to the Incarnation, then the divine maternity and association in the redemption are distinguished formally.

The Incarnation, though destined for the redemption of the human race, could have been accomplished in Mary's womb without her consent; indeed, it could have happened without her knowing it and even against her will. Therefore, if Mary's free consent to the Incarnation was sought and obtained, so that she thus concurred in the redemption of man, it was due only to the will of God. In revealing this great mystery to her through the angel, He willed that she be not only the mother but also the companion and partner of her Son as Redeemer of the human race.

Moreover, the divine maternity is formally distinguished from

association in the redemption by acts which followed the Incarnation, since those acts were in no way a necessary consequence of the Incarnation nor of the divine maternity. The Mother, by the sole fact of having freely conceived the Son, did not necessarily participate proximately in the work which was to be performed by her Son.

As Mary's cooperation in the redemption presupposes a Redeemer possessing a human nature, by the same consent with which she freely concurred in the Incarnation, she was constituted a consort of His. Therefore, strictly speaking, her cooperation began from the very moment of the Incarnation, for just as the Redeemer ordained all His intentions to the redemption from the very beginning, so the Blessed Virgin, from the moment that she pronounced her *fiat,* directed all her intentions to the purpose of the redemption, in full submission to the will of the Father who gave His Son and to the will of the Son who offered Himself for the salvation of men. She exercised it from the beginning and she still exercises it. The words of Pope Leo XIII are very fitting: "When she professed herself the handmaid of the Lord for the mother's office, and when, in the Temple, she offered her whole self with her Child Jesus, she was established as His consort in the painful expiation offered by her Son for the sins of the world. It cannot be doubted, therefore, that in the very depths of her soul she shared the most bitter sufferings of her divine Son." [1]

Although the divine maternity and cooperation in redemption are formally distinct, there is such a close and even necessary relationship between them that her cooperation presupposes and is based upon her maternity, and her maternity is ordered to her cooperation. Thus, Pope Pius XI states that she was chosen to be the Mother of God precisely that she might be His consort.

No other creature could be chosen as more apt for this redemptive association than the Mother of the Redeemer. No one else could possess such intimacy with the Redeemer nor be so closely united to Him in His persecutions, labors, anxieties and above all in His passion and death. As Friethoff explains: "Only the mother of one suffering can suffer with him; other women can only be moved to pity." [2]

To this we may add that it is natural for a mother not to be ignorant of the affairs of her Son, but to intervene in order to promote

them as much as she is able. Hence, this would be true of Mary, in whose virginal womb her Son became incarnate in order to free the human race by the merit of His death and by the price of His blood. Tin's she ardently desired, desiring also that the passion of her Son should bear fruit in all souls and thereby effect the salvation of men.

CHAPTER TWO

Marys Cooperation in Objective Redemption

*

Redemption can be divided into objective and subjective. The first is the entire redemptive work of Christ on earth, by which He willed to restore and elevate the human race, fallen through the sin of our first parents. Subjective redemption is the application of Christ's objective redemption to each man.

Objective redemption is the universal cause of human salvation. But every universal cause must be applied in particular to each one that is to share in the effect of the universal cause. For that reason objective redemption is called the *work of salvation,* and subjective redemption is called *saving action.* The first is like a fountain from which flow forth the goods of redemption, the treasures of grace; the second is like the stream from which those goods are dispensed to each and every one of the redeemed.

Objective redemption can be considered in two senses, one more general and the other more specific. In the first instance, redemption comprises all that Christ accomplished on earth in order to transfer the human race from the state of injustice to the state of justice and holiness as sons of God. As stated by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians (1:13), "He has rescued us from the power of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of His beloved Son." St. John says in his first Epistle (3:14) : "We know that we have passed from death to life." In the second case, redemption concerns special marks or aspects which are found in the redemptive work, such as satisfaction, merit, sacrifice or redemption strictly speaking.

The whole question, therefore, can be easily divided into five sections. The first considers Mary's cooperation in objective redemption, taken in its most general sense; the other four consider her

cooperation with regard to each one of the special aspects of the redemption of the human race.

Cooperation in Redemption in General

The truth of redemption by Christ is a dogma of Catholic faith, the basis of the Christian religion and the foundation of the entire divine economy in the salvation of the world, as is evident in the Nicene Creed: "Who for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven"; in the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople: "He was crucified also for us"; and in the Athanasian Creed: "Suffered for our salvation." For this reason, Pope Paul IV condemned the Socinians as heretics because they held the doctrine of a merely moral redemption and denied that Christ died to free us from sin and death and to reconcile us with the Father for eternal life.[1]

This truth is clear in the Gospels. St. John (1:29) points to Christ as the Lamb of God "who takes away the sins of the world"; St. Luke (19:10) says that the "Son of Man came to seek and to save what was lost." St. John (3:17) states that "God did not send His Son into the world in order to judge the world, but that the world might be saved through Him"; and in his first Epistle he says of Christ, that He is "a propitiation for our sins." St. Paul repeats this doctrine in his first Epistle to Timothy (1:15) with these words: "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." To this we may add the tradition and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and St. Augustine's testimony is sufficient to demonstrate this fact: "For no other reason did the Lord come into the world but to save sinners."[2] Finally, the liturgy of the Church chants joyfully on Holy Saturday: "O happy fault, that merited so great a Redeemer!"

Although all of Christ's works and sufferings contributed to our redemption and salvation, so that any act of His would have been sufficient to accomplish it by reason of His infinite dignity, nevertheless, the redemption of the human race is attributed especially to His death on the Cross. Thus, the Council of Trent explicitly declares: "If anyone asserts that this sin of Adam ... is taken away ... by any other remedy than the merit of the one Mediator, our Lord Jesus

Christ, who hath reconciled us to God in His own blood, made unto us justice, sanctification and redemption, . . . let him be anathema." 8

Sacred Scripture abounds in eloquent expressions in which redemption is attributed to Christ's death. St. Matthew (20:28) says: "The Son of Man has not come to be served but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many." The same is stated in St. Mark (10:4;) and St. John, who says (3:14-15): "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that those who believe in Him may not perish, but may have life everlasting." And the Apocalypse (1:5) declares: "And from Jesus Christ . . . , who has loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood."

St. Paul frequently affirms that Christ's death on the Cross worked our salvation: "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Rom. 5:10); "You, who were once afar off, have been brought near through the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:13); "In whom we have our redemption, the remission of our sins" (Col. 1:14). And St. Peter writes: "You know that you were redeemed from the vain manner of life handed down from your fathers, not with perishable things, with silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1:18-19).

All of the Fathers affirm this same truth. St. Clement of Rome says that Christ shed His blood for us; St. Ignatius states that Christ suffered all those things to save us. The same doctrine is taught by St. Polycarp, St. Hippolytus, St. Athanasius, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Epiphanius and others.

However, although the passion and death of Christ was not absolutely necessary for the redemption of mankind (for Christ could have saved man in any other way), nevertheless, God, in His eternal designs, had disposed that Christ's works and sufferings would figure in the redemption of the human race, crowned by His passion and death as a supreme consummation of all His previous actions and of the merits already obtained. Hence St. Thomas says: "Speaking simply and absolutely, it was possible for God to deliver mankind otherwise than by the passion of Christ, because 'no word shall be impossible with God' (Luke 1:37). Yct was impossible if some supposition be made. For since it is impossible for God's foreknowl-

edge to be deceived and His will or ordinance to be frustrated, then, supposing God's foreknowledge and ordinance regarding Christ's passion, it was not possible at the same time for Christ not to suffer and for mankind to be delivered otherwise than by Christ's passion." 4

St. Bonaventure explains that this manner of redemption was chosen from among all others as being the most noble imaginable, the most acceptable and pleasing to God, the most fitting in order to remedy the evil done, the most efficacious in attracting the human race, and the most prudent for defeating the enemy.5

Having reviewed this doctrine, we now pass on to the consideration of Mary's cooperation in the work of objective redemption. It is not necessary to remark that the *absolute* necessity of Mary's cooperation in redemption must be excluded from the beginning, since our Lord could have restored mankind to His friendship without the Virgin's intervention. Hence St. Pius X stated: "Could not God have given us the Redeemer of the human race and the Author of the faith in another way than through the Virgin?" 0 Therefore the question of Mary's cooperation always has to be established on God's free ordinance, by which He willed that the Virgin should concur and cooperate in redemption. This cooperation is twofold: one remote, by which Mary gave Christ His flesh, not through any physical act alone but by an entirely voluntary act, so that He could thereby pay the price of our redemption; the other proximate, that is to say, by cooperating immediately, by her personal action, in the redemption which was effected by the passion and death of Christ.

thesis: *Mary cooperated in the work of redemption remotely and physically.* (This doctrine is *de fide.)*

Errors. Mary's remote and fundamental cooperation in redemption was necessarily denied by the Docetists, who affirmed that Christ assumed an imaginary body or a vaporous body by which He passed through Mary but received absolutely nothing from her; by the Modernists, who denied the truth of redemption by Christ; and by the Socinians and Liberal Protestants, who destroyed the genuine meaning of the term.

Sacred Scripture. Although there is no express mention of Mary's remote cooperation in the redemption, it is stated clearly and ex-

plicitly in Scripture that Mary is the Mother of Christ (Matt. 1:18), the Mother of the Lord (Luke 1:43), the Mother of Jesus (John 2:11), and the word "mother" is taken in the proper sense, as when the angel Gabriel announced to Mary: "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and shalt bring forth a son; and thou shalt call His name Jesus" (Luke 1:31). Now, according to the teaching of Scripture, Christ is the Redeemer of the world. Therefore, as His Mother, Mary cooperated remotely in the redemption, since she was the one who gave the Redeemer to the world.

Fathers and Theologians. St. Epiphanius says that Eve is the origin and beginning of the entire human race but it was Mary who introduced life to the world, because in giving birth to Him who is life itself, she is the Mother of those who live.[7] St. Augustine says: "By a woman came death, by a woman life. From Eve came destruction, but from Mary came salvation."[8] Again, he states that although she was only the handmaid, she gave birth to her Lord so God could redeem the world through her.[9] St. Fulgence says that Mary is the window of heaven through which God allowed the true light to pass into the world; she is the celestial ladder by which God Himself descended to earth; she is the restoration and glory of woman, since by her they have been withdrawn from the first curse.[10] St. Ildephonse writes in these beautiful words: "Grant me to know how to unite myself to God and to thee . . . : to Him as God and to thee as the Mother of God; to Him as my Redeemer, to thee as the work of my redemption. For what He became for my redemption, He truly formed from thy person. That which He did for me as my Redeemer, He did for thee as thy Son. What He offered as the price of my ransom was His incarnation in thy womb."[11] Richard of St. Lawrence and Denis the Carthusian speak in a similar way.[13]

Theological Argument. That which is the cause of the cause is the cause of the effect produced by the cause. Therefore, if Mary is the Mother of the Redeemer, she was necessarily the cause of our life and restoration in her own Son, Jesus Christ. Hence, the Church praises her as the one through whom life was restored to the redeemed.[18]

And truly Mary, conceiving Christ for us, supplied the material from which the price of our redemption was to be paid, that is, the

flesh or human nature in which Christ could suffer and die. For this reason, St. Thomas of Villanova stated that Christ paid the price of our ransom, but Mary gave Him the means of paying it.[14]

thesis: *Mary cooperated explicitly and formally in the work of redemption, not only physically, but also by moral actions, that is, by freely consenting to the Incarnation.*

Previous Observations. It is not necessary to prove that Mary's free consent was sought for the work of the Incarnation and that she gave it readily. Therefore, all that we shall do in the present thesis is prove that her consent influenced the redemption of mankind and that she cooperated in our redemption explicitly and formally. It is *de fide* or *proxima fidei* that by her free consent to the Incarnation, Mary also freely cooperated in the redemption. It is the certain and common teaching of theologians that her cooperation was explicit and formal.

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Leo XIII: "Tire eternal Son of God, about to take upon Himself our nature for the saving and ennobling of man, and about to consummate thus a mystical union between Himself and all mankind, did not accomplish His design without obtaining the free consent of her who was to become His Mother. She was the representative of all mankind." [16]

And in another place he says: "For no single individual can even be imagined who has ever contributed or ever will contribute so much toward reconciling man with God. To mankind, heading for eternal ruin, she offered a Savior when she received the announcement of the mystery of peace brought to this earth by the angel; and giving her consent, she gave it in the name of the whole human race." [10]

Fathers and Theologians. Tire Fathers of the early centuries, such as Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian and several others, originated and frequently repeated the comparison of Mary with Eve. They also made explicit their teaching on Mary's moral cooperation in the work of redemption precisely through her free consent given to the angel at the announcement of the great mystery of the Incarnation.

The Fathers frequently demonstrate that God worked out man's redemption in such a way that whatever the devil invented for man's ruination was turned back upon himself. Thus, as in the fall of man,

Adam and Eve and the devil intervened, so man's restoration involved Christ and Mary and the archangel Gabriel. Adam was the author of man's fall, but Christ is the cause of man's salvation. The evil spirit suggested sin, but Gabriel was the messenger of man's reparation. Eve, the first woman, believed the devil, followed his suggestions, disobeyed God, and thus cooperated in the ruin of all men; the second woman, Mary, obeyed God, gave her consent to the Incarnation with a living faith and complete liberty, and thus cooperated in the restoration and salvation of the entire human race.

St. Justin says: "Eve . . . conceived the word of the devil and brought forth death and disobedience; the Virgin Mary, filled with faith and joy, answered the archangel Gabriel's glad tidings: Be it done unto me according to thy word."[17]

St. Irenaeus: "As Eve was through her disobedience the cause of death to herself and the entire human race, so Mary, through her obedience, was the source of salvation to herself and the whole human race."[18]

Tertullian: "The wrong done by the credulity of the former was obliterated by the faith of the latter."[19]

Added to these are many other Fathers who in their works emphasize the antithesis between Mary and Eve. Thus, St. Cyril of Jerusalem says: "Through the virgin Eve came death; therefore it was fitting that through, or rather from, another virgin should come life. The serpent deceived the first, but the angel Gabriel brought a new message to the second. . . . The devil used the flesh against us . . . , hence we have been saved by the selfsame weapons which the devil previously used against us."[20] St. Augustine and St. Peter Chrysologus write in like manner.[21]

Likewise, we find among the Fathers a clear affirmation of Mary's consent in the work of redemption. This is clearly set forth by St. Ambrose and St. Bernard. Says St. Bernard: "Thou hast heard, O Mary, that thou wouldst conceive and bear a son. Thou hast heard that this would not be done by the work of man but by the Holy Ghost. . . . The angel awaits thy answer. We also, O Lady, on whom weighs the sentence of condemnation, await thy word of mercy. We shall immediately be free if you consent."[23]

Theological Argument. Mary cooperated actively in the work of the Incarnation, whose realization depended on her free consent,

according to the decree and eternal providence of God. But the Incarnation is completely ordained to the redemption of mankind. Thus, as St. Albert the Great explains *(In Luc.,* 10:38), she received the author of salvation who, in His mother's womb, began the work of our salvation.

By freely consenting to the Incarnation, Mary directed her consent to the Redemption, not only implicitly, but also explicitly and formally, since she viewed the Incarnation with regard to the redemption of mankind. Tin's affirmation is clearly contained in the words of the angel: "Thou shalt conceive in thy womb and shalt bring forth a son; and thou shalt call His name Jesus." Now in Hebrew, the name Jesus is the same as salvation or savior. Hence, St. Albert the Great says that Mary was instructed by the angel concerning the conception and the kingdom begun in her and perfected in her Son *(In Luc.* 10:39).

Moreover, the angel, in his conversation with the Virgin, adds immediately: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give Him the throne of David His father, and He shall be king over the house of Jacob forever." These words describe the Son to be bom of a Virgin as the one who, according to prophetic visions, is to be the Messias-King, with His messianic kingdom, which is not a material or political one, but essentially spiritual and religious, full of goods surpassing all earthly goods, among which shines that of human redemption.

It is not just to deny to Mary the knowledge of the prophetic predictions concerning the future Messias and the characteristics of His kingdom, since the aged Anna and Simeon had known them and were waiting for the redemption of Israel. Nor can it be asserted that Mary believed the false opinions of the general public concerning the future Messias or accepted the false messianic ideas of the Pharisees, who deserved that He should call them "blind guides of blind men" (Matt. 15:14).

In her conversation with the angel, Mary seems to doubt the manner of the accomplishment of the Incarnation: "How shall this happen, since I do not know man?"

St. Ambrose explains these words by saying that Mary surely knew the prophecy which stated that a virgin would conceive and bring forth a son, but she did not know how the prophecy would be ful-

filled. Therefore, when Mary asked the question, she did not doubt the fact that a virgin would conceive, but she merely asked how the fact was to be accomplished.[23]

Bainvcl states that at the annunciation Mary was asked not only to be the mother of the Redeemer, King and Messias, but also to cooperate in the salvation of the human race, the messianic work and the establishment of the kingdom.[24]

t h e s i s: *Mary cooperated proximately and immediately in human redemption by her maternal compassion.*

Previous Observations. Let us recall first of all that Mary suffered innumerable sorrows during her lifetime. "It is not difficult," says St. Peter Canisius, "for pious souls accustomed to meditation to find in the study of the Gospel many serious motives for the profound suffering and continual agony which must have tormented the soul and the most sweet heart of Mary, to the point of drawing copious tears from her virginal eyes. What Christ said of all the elect—'you will suffer tribulations in the world'—must have reached its apex in Mary." »

Mary must have perceived many things as causes of sensible pain and spiritual suffering: in herself, such as afflictions of her body and soul, in others, on seeing the great sins of mankind, especially the incredulity of the Jews, and finally in Christ, such as His poverty, the contempt, insults and persecutions He suffered, and chiefly His passion. All of these things must have tormented the soul of Mary. Pope Benedict XIV confirms this when he says that the Blessed Virgin knew in advance, not only her Son's passion, but all of the circumstances involved, and more clearly than did David, Isaias or any other prophet.[20]

Certainly, such great afflictions reached their apex in Christ's cruel passion, and Mary accompanied Him in His sufferings when, at the foot of the Cross, her heart was pierced with the sword of sorrow. Her maternal sorrow did to her what the nails and spear did to the flesh of Jesus. The nails and spear caused the *Passion;* her maternal love caused the *Compassion.*

Although everything done and suffered by Christ contributed to human redemption in such a way that even the slightest suffering would have sufficed to complete it, nevertheless, it is especially at-

tributed to His passion and death as the principal work and the ultimate complement or crown of the rest. Therefore, we must consider Mary's compassion in the same way, and therefore wc state that Marj', by her compassion, the crown and apex of all her sufferings, cooperated in a proximate manner in the redemption of the world.

Opinions. Mary's proximate cooperation in redemption was denied, for various reasons, by Billot, De la Taille, Ude, Rivière, Smith, Lennerz, Goossens, Philips and others.[27]

According to Alameda, Mary's great triumph begins with her consent to the Incarnation and ends on her giving birth to the Savior.[28] Bartmann, cited among the objectors of Mary's proximate cooperation in the work of redemption, abandoned his opinion and joined those who defended it.[29] But the greater majority of theologians admit and defend Mary's immediate cooperation in objective redemption.

Magisterium of the Popes. The ordinary magisterium of the Roman Pontiffs is openly in favor of this cooperation of Mary in Christ's redemptive work. Pope Pius VII stated that all the Christian faithful are obliged to venerate the memory of the bitter sufferings which Mary endured, especially at the foot of the Cross, for their salvation, and they should heed the precept which Tobias gave to his son: "For thou must be mindful what and how great perils [thy mother] suffered for thee" (Tob. 4:4).[30]

Pope Leo XIII stated that God initiated the redemption of the human race through Mary and that she thereby assumed a divine and perpetual obligation by which, in union with the joys and sorrows, opprobriums and triumphs of Christ, she felt constrained to direct and aid men in the attainment of eternal life.[31]

And in another place he says that when she presented herself to God as a handmaid for the mother's office, and when she offered up her whole self with her Child Jesus in the Temple, she was constituted His companion in the painful expiation offered by her Son for the sins of the world. It is certain, therefore, that she suffered in the very depths of her soul with His most bitter sufferings and with His torments. On the other hand, the Pope continues, Mary stood close to His cross, and so great was her love for us, whom she was to receive as her children, that she generously offered her own Son

to the justice of God and spiritually died with Him, pierced by the sword of sorrow.[82]

St. Pius X writes: "By this communion of sufferings and wills between Christ and Mary, she merited to become the most worthy reparatrix of the entire world." [83] Pope Benedict XV says that Mary suffered so intensely together with Jesus that she almost died, and that it may therefore be said that she redeemed the human race with Him.[84] Pope Pius XI stated that it was the common teaching of the Doctors of the Church and the universal sentiment of the faithful that by her sufferings the Virgin cooperated with Christ in the redemption of the world.[85] The same Pope is the author of the fervent supplication: "O Mother of piety and of mercy, who assisted thy most sweet Son as co-sufferer and co-redemptrix when, on the altar of the Cross, He effected the redemption of the world, ... we beg thee to conserve in us and to increase daily in us the precious fruits of the redemption and thy compassion."[38]

Sacred Scripture. "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed. She shall crush thy head and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel" (Gen. 3:15). The crushing of the serpent's head presupposes Mary's association with Christ in the work of redemption, by which a complete victory was won over the devil and sin was destroyed.

Tin's triumph was achieved through Christ's passion and death, as St. Peter says in his first Epistle (3:18): "Christ also died once for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." And St. Paul says in his Epistle to the Hebrews (2:14-15): "That through death He might destroy him who had the empire of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver them who throughout their life were kept in servitude by the fear of death." To the Colossians (2:14-15), he says: "Cancelling the decree against us, which was hostile to us. Indeed, He has taken it completely away, nailing it to the cross. Disarming the principalities and powers, He displayed them openly, leading them away in triumph by force of it." Therefore, we must say that Mary also, the associate of Christ in the redemption, shared in the redemptive passion and death of her Son, since with Him she suffered and almost died.

The Fathers and Theologians. The Fathers of the early centuries,

such as Justin, Irenaeus and Tertullian, although they do not expressly teach the doctrine of Mary's cooperation in Christ's passion and death, nevertheless sowed the seed in the parallelism they established between Mary and Eve, which can reasonably be extended to Mary's cooperation at the Cross.[87] The parallelism refers especially to the obedience of Mary regarding the Incarnation, as opposed to the disobedience of Eve, but the general idea proposed by the Fathers is that the work of redemption was effected in a manner similar to that in the fall of the human race. This demands Mary's cooperation at the Cross, on which Christ conquered Satan and completed the work of human redemption, as affirmed by St. Ambrose and St. John Chrysostom.[88] They clearly teach that Mary, by the sufferings and wounds of her motherly heart, added something to the general and external passion of her Son, and that in union with her suffering and dying Son, she cooperated in some way in the redemption of mankind. Nor are St. Ambrose's words opposed to this when he says: "But Jesus did not need a helper to redeem all," for although He alone redeemed man, by divine decree Mary was given Him as a fitting helper, although she was not absolutely necessary.

St. Augustine, or whoever was the author of the words we are about to quote (they go back at least to the fifth century), after describing how the Blessed Virgin yearned for the salutary wine to come to the world and actually produced the fruit from which the wine would be pressed, says: "O Virgin, the day will come when thy fruit will be pressed and a sword will pierce thy heart so that you will suffer with the hanging cluster (Jesus) which you produced from the root."[80]

Since the twelfth century, theological writers present Mary explicitly as Christ's partner in redemption, suffering with Him for the salvation of mankind. It is expressly stated by Arnold of Chartres, Abbot of Bonneval: "You see in that temple two altars, one in the breast of Mary, the other in the body of Christ; Christ sacrificed His flesh, Mary her soul. She wished to add her blood to the blood of His soul and body, to celebrate with her Son, with hands up raised on the Cross, His evening sacrifice, and to consummate with our Lord Jesus the mystery of our redemption by the death of her body. But it was the sole privilege of the high priest to bring the tribute of blood into the holies, and this distinction

could be shared with no one else. In the reparation of mankind no angel or man could have this authority in common with Him. Nevertheless, this disposition of the Mother cooperated much, in its own way, to propitiate God, since the charity of Christ presented to the Father His own as well as His Mother's prayers and desires; for what the Mother asked, the Son approved and the Father granted." 10

"Doubtless," says Arnold, "there was one will between Christ and Mary, and both at the same time offered to God one sacrifice, the one in the blood of her heart, the other in the blood of His body." 41

Rupert Deutz pictures Mary's compassion as similar to the pains of childbirth in which Mary, with Christ, gave birth to the children of grace.42

Denis the Carthusian inquires why Jesus did not excuse His most loving Mother from being present at the Cross. He answers by saying that since divine providence governs all and everything happens with good reason, God wanted her to be the cooperator in the universal salvation and the protectress of the Church. He decreed that many souls would be saved through her.43

Richard of St. Lawrence states that the Lord was with her and she was with the Lord in the work of human redemption. The Mother of mercy aided the Father of mercies in the work of our salvation.44

John Gerson says that Mary participated in redemption to such an extent that she would have been disposed to pay the price of our ransom if her Son's efforts had not been sufficient, though actually Christ's redemptive work was sufficient to redeem thousands of worlds.48

St. Bonaventure states that Mary should be praised and loved in an extraordinary manner because she suffered with Christ to such an extent that she would gladly have suffered all the torments that He suffered and she was grateful that her Son offered Himself for the sins of the world.40

St. Albert the Great states that Mary suffered in her soul what Christ suffered in His body and to her alone was given the privilege of participating in His passion. As a reward, her Son deigned to communicate to her the merits of His passion. As the whole world

is indebted to Christ for His passion, it is indebted to Mary for her compassion.47

Ludolph of Saxony, or whoever wrote the book *Speculum humanae salvationis* (1324), says that Christ conquered the devil by His passion and Mary conquered him by her compassion as Mother.*·

Theological Argument. Mary, the companion of Christ, participated from the first moment in the redemption of the human race. But since the redemption had to reach its coronation in the passion and death of the Lord, it was most fitting that Mary, associated inseparably with Christ, should participate in the redemption, both at its beginning and in its consummation. Hence St. Pius X said: "There was never any separation in the lives and works of the Son and the Mother, so that the words of the Psalm (30:11) could be applied equally to both: 'My life is wasted with grief and my years in sighs.' " *8

Mary fulfilled some office by standing beneath the Cross, which was not without divine purpose, as the Doctors of the Church teach. The mere passive assistance of Mary at the cruel spectacle of the Cross, on which her Son suffered an ignominious and most cruel death, does not explain her presence there, even considering her heroic charity, sublime fortitude, the power of her example and other mystical reasons which result from her act. Her *active* cooperation in the work of redemption must be admitted. Thus, Simon of Cassia says that it was never the custom for women to assist at the death of their sons who are condemned to death, although they would assist at their death if it occurred at home. Earthly mothers always avoid the contemplation of their sons' torments, and even more so, if their deaths be caused by inhuman assassins, to the point of not being able to bear up without dying themselves.60

It cannot be said that Mary's cooperation in objective redemption in any way detracts from the perfection, efficacy and universality of redemption as proper to Christ alone. Mary's cooperation is not parallel but essentially subordinated to Christ's redemptive work, upon which her cooperation depends and from which it derives all its value. We know from revelation that Christ is the sole Redeemer of mankind, according to the words of the Apostle in his first Epistle

to Timothy (2:5-6): "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all." In the Acts of the Apostles (4:12) we read: "For there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved." But although Christ alone is entirely and perfectly our Redeemer, it is not at all unfitting to affirm that Mary cooperated in the redemption of man in an inferior degree, subordinate to Christ and dependent on His merits. Thus we read in St. Matthew (23:10): "For one only is your Master, the Christ."

If anyone proposes an objection to this doctrine by citing the words of Isaias (63:3): "I have trodden the winepress alone, and of the Gentiles there is not a man with Me"—words which seem to pertain exclusively to Christ—we answer that Isaias applied the word "man" to all except the Blessed Virgin, who actually did tread the winepress with Him and cooperated with Him and our redemption.61

Finally, the universality of redemption by Christ is not restricted by this doctrine, in the sense that Mary herself would not have been redeemed, because although she is co-redemptrix, she was not only redeemed but was the first among the redeemed. St. Ambrose states that Christ began His redemptive work by redeeming Mary so that she would be the first to receive salvation from her Son and that through her would be prepared the redemption of all.62

On the other hand, Mary's cooperation was not futile or inefficacious. It is certain that Christ realized the work of redemption fully, without any defect whatever, and that Mary s cooperation could not add anything to the intrinsic perfection of the work nor could she have completed it if Christ had left anything undone. Nevertheless, there are many who assert that Mary s cooperation was useful so far as she adds an accidental perfection to the work of Christ, giving it a certain harmony and beauty, though they do not say exactly what it is.

This must be explained in such a way that the beauty and harmony which the cooperation of the Virgin adds to redemption would not be something merely static, in which Mary contributed nothing, but dynamic, that is, some influence of hers in the redemption of mankind. For it is proper to man that, in conformity with his rational and free nature, nothing can happen in the moral

order without his consent and willing cooperation. Just as this occurs with respect to the grace of justification, which is given to a particular man, and thus produces a "formal" justification, so the same effect must be produced, as far as possible, when we treat of the immense benefit of redemption, which is given to all men in general and is know as "virtual" justification.[53]

Absolutely speaking, a man can be justified without the consent of his will, but ordinarily and according to God's most gentle ordinance, he will never be justified without the action of his free will, by which he prepares, cooperates with and accepts the divine gift of grace. In like manner, although Christ did not need any cooperation whatever in order to redeem mankind, it was fitting, nevertheless, that men, through God's gentle providence, should not be redeemed without their own cooperation in this work of reconciliation, without the mutual ratification of so sublime an alliance and without the acceptance of such a lofty benefit.

Hence, God willed to unite to Christ, the Redeemer of men, Mary, as His companion and the representative of the entire human race, in whose name she gave her consent to the incarnation of the Redeemer, and, taking their place as the representative of the human race, she united herself to the Lord's passion and death on the Cross. She did not assist in a passive manner, but cooperated actively by her maternal compassion arid ineffable sharing in the sufferings of her Son.[54] Father Bernard states that in Mary "the humanity that saves was united in an eminent degree to the humanity that is saved. Mary received everything that comes to us from the Cross, without losing any particle of it, and she brought to the Crucified all the support He could expect from us."[55]

But an objection is raised in opposition to Mary's cooperation in the work of redemption. Mary had need of redemption and was truly redeemed by Christ. But if she cooperated in objective redemption, she cooperated in her own redemption and actually redeemed herself. But to redeem herself, she needed the grace of Christ, which issued as the fruit of objective redemption, which was consummated on the Cross.

To this we answer that it is certain that Mary needed redemption and was truly redeemed by her Son; indeed, she was the first to be redeemed, as declared by St. Ambrose: "The Lord, having to redeem

the world, began His work through Mary, so that she would be the first to benefit from the fruits of redemption; for it was through her that the salvation of all would be prepared."[']·

Bearing this in mind, can it be asserted that by cooperating in the redemption of man, Mary cooperated in her own and redeemed herself? F. X. Godts maintains this opinion without any hesitation whatsoever. He goes on to explain that it was effected *sublimiori modo,* in the words of Pope Pius XI, in view of the future merits of Christ. Further, the incarnation of the Word depended on Mary's consent to the angel, and therefore, in giving her consent, it is evident that she concurred in her own redemption.[57] Schiith and Campana arc also of the opinion that Mary redeemed henelf, not by physical causality, but by a subordinate moral causality.[5']

Other theologians explicitly deny that Mary redeemed henelf. Among these are Pesch and Bittrcmieux, who argue that Mary could not merit her own redemption, because Christ the Redeemer was the only one who could merit it, in accordance with the axiom that the beginning of merit cannot be merited.[5']

For the explanation of this difficulty we must remember the following:

i) The divine maternity was not bestowed on Mary through the foreknown and future merits of Jesus, but gratuitously and solely through the beneficent will of God.

2) All of her gifts and prerogatives, the purity and outstanding holiness with which she was adorned that she might be a most worthy dwelling for the Son of God, including her immaculate conception, were given to her in view of the merits of Christ.

3) The grace with which Mary was provided so that she might give her free consent to the angel in the annunciation of the divine Incarnation was also the fruit of those merits.

4) Lastly, the divine maternity is anterior to the sanctity and graces bestowed upon Mary. Nevertheless, this priority is not to be found *in ria executions,* that is, in the exercise of that maternity, since the graces received were dispositions for the divine maternity and therefore had to precede it. Moreover, Mary began the exercise of her divine maternity with dependence on the consent given to the angel, for which she was also prepared in order to be worthy of the conception of the Son of God. Therefore the priority of

which we speak must be understood *in ordine intentionis*, that is, by a priority of intention.[60]

Taking into consideration what has been said, it seems that we must hold the following:

1) As regards Mary's proximate cooperation in objective redemption, in no way can it be admitted that the Virgin could redeem herself, because in order to cooperate in this way, she needed the graces which proceed from redemption itself and presuppose that Mar}' is already redeemed.

2) Considering the remote cooperation by her free consent to the Incarnation as redemptive, neither could Mary redeem herself, because to give this consent she was prepared by the grace of Christ and therefore she already participated in the fruit of redemption.

3) Lastly, if we consider only Mary's remote cooperation in objective redemption through her purely physical maternity, abstracting from every other grace, such as appears in the first decree of the divine will which chose her for that office, then it may well be said that Mary redeemed herself, because she gave Christ the means of redemption in favor of herself and the whole human race, and in this sense the following words of St. Irenaeus apply: "Mary . . . was the cause of salvation for herself and the whole human race." [61]

Cooperation in Redemption in Particular

To study Mary's cooperation in the work of redemption in particular is to study Marian intervention in each of the aspects of Christ's Redemption, that is, so far as it was satisfactory, meritorious, sacrificial and strictly redemptive. One may deny or doubt Mary's cooperation in one or another of these aspects but her cooperation in objective redemption is certain because of her maternal compassion.

SATISFACTORY ASPECT OF MARY'S COOPERATION

Previous Remarks. Satisfaction, in general, is equivalent to the payment or compensation of some debt. In this wide sense it can be applied to any kind of debt, whether of gratitude, fidelity or justice. Satisfaction through justice, which is what we are treating here, may be *real* or *personal*, depending on the kind of debt to be paid. Personal debt arises from injury done to another; real debt arises from anything which we owe in justice to any person. The satisfaction corresponding to a real debt is restitution rather than satisfaction, since it consists in the restoration of another person's goods or the reparation for damage done. Personal satisfaction is compensation for injury unjustly inflicted on the honor due to another person.

There are three types of satisfaction: strict, condign and congruous. *Strict satisfaction* is that which, in order to pay the debt, observes all the conditions of perfect justice: a) it must be directed to another, a condition common to satisfaction in general and to strict justice, since no one can make satisfaction to himself, as he cannot do injury to himself; b) it must be equal to the debt, since otherwise there would be only a partial and not a complete satisfaction; c) it may not depend on any grace or liberality on the part of the creditor, since grace is opposed to strict justice and payment cannot be considered as strict and complete if it is accepted by the favor or benevolent indulgence of the creditor; d) it must be made out of the goods of the debtor and not from anyone else's, because no one can pay his own debts with another's money; e) what is offered in compensation must not be owed by any other title of justice, even though it could be owed out of gratitude, friendship or any other; f) the satisfaction must be such that it obliges the person injured to accept it in justice and to erase the debt, even if he does not wish to do so; g) it must be offered by the offender in person, or, if someone else takes his place, this substitution must be accepted by the person offended.

Condign satisfaction is that which is in proportion to the debt,

even though al] the conditions demanded by perfect justice arc not present.

Congruous satisfaction is that in which not only the conditions of perfect and strict justice arc lacking, but also the equality and proportion to the debt, yet the creditor condescends to accept it out of his own goodness and benevolence.

The satisfaction we are treating here is that offered to God for the injurj' or offense He has received through sin. By supreme right, God necessarily demands of the rational creature the recognition of His infinite excellence, through the orientation of his whole being to God as his final end and the observance of His law, wherein consists the honor which the creature owes to God. But the honor due to God is injured through sin, because the sinner voluntarily separates himself from God, his final end, by placing his end in some creature when he adheres to it inordinately, thus breaking God's law and disturbing the order established by God. The sinner thus incurs a double debt: that of the fault and that of punishment, because without the punishment, law would lack sufficient sanction.

From this it follows that the essential element of satisfaction involves two aspects: voluntariness and punishment. The one who suffered the injury or offense by the voluntary negation of the honor to which he has a right can be compensated only by the restoration of that honor of which he was in some way deprived. But compensation cannot be made for honor as in material injury, through the giving of something equivalent, but by the voluntary bestowal of some truly honorable gift.

Satisfaction compensates the injured person for the honor of which he is deprived. By sin, esteem is taken away from God, who should be preferred to all created things, since the sinner, by following his own will inordinately, loves and desires some good excessively and pursues it in preference to God. Therefore, to make compensation it is necessary that the sinner accept and suffer the corresponding punishment.

Of the two elements of satisfaction, voluntariness is the formal element and punishment is the material element, because it is only through the voluntary acceptance of punishment that penal satisfaction for sin has moral value and is acceptable to God. As St.

Thomas says: "In satisfaction, the affection of the offerer is of greater value than the quantity of the offering.''62

Satisfaction may be made by the offender himself or by another. If it is made by another, taking the place of the offender, it is called *vicarious* atonement. This satisfaction of one for another supposes two things: 1) a solidarity, either natural or moral, must exist between the offender and his proxy so that the one suffers for the other as if they were one and the same person; 2) that the person offended accept the substitution.

Since it is impossible that one take upon himself formally the guilt of the sin of another, so that he would himself become the sinner for the other, and since it is repugnant that one person be punished for the sin of another if it is a question of punishment strictly speaking, it follows that vicarious atonement can consist only in the voluntary assumption of the obligation to atone for the sin of another by one's own sufferings.

That our Lord satisfied for us by a real and true satisfaction is testified by the Council of Trent, Pope Leo XIII, and it was proposed as a truth to be defined by the Vatican Council.*3 This satisfaction which Christ made for us to the Father by reason of His solidarity with the human race also resulted in the fact that all men are considered as redeemed in Him. By reason of the Incarnation, Christ, true God and true man, was constituted juridical Head of the human race, a second Adam who represented the entire human race in relation to justification by grace (Rom. 5:18). This office of satisfying for man was freely taken on by Christ in conformity with the words of Isaias (53:7): "He was offered because it was His own will," and the Father not only approved of this substitution, but offered it generously, delivering His Son for us (Rom. 8:32).

It is not necessary to demonstrate that the vicarious satisfaction of Christ is infinite, because His human actions were endowed with an infinite value, since they were proper to an infinite person. The value of satisfactory action is not measured by the nature of the agent nor the excellence of natural or supernatural powers, but by the dignity of the person who performs the action.®1 Hence it follows that Christ's satisfaction was not only condign, but complete and superabundant; even more, presupposing the gratuitousness of the

present economy in human reparation, it was completely rigorous, in conformity with the demands of strict justice.

In summary: Christ's satisfaction not only equalled but far surpassed the injury which He had to repair, as the Apostle stated: "Where the offense has abounded, grace has abounded yet more" (Rom. 5:20). St. John Chrysostom says: "For Christ paid far more than we owed, and in a larger measure, as the infinite ocean exceeds in magnitude a tiny drop of water." 65

The theological argument maintains that Christ's satisfaction is infinite generically, while sin is infinite only under some aspect. It is true that while Christ's action is, on the one hand, entitatively finite as a human act, considered as the *principium quo* of all His operations, it pertains, nevertheless, to the Person of the Word as the *principium quod* and thus is proper to the Word of God. Now, the value of satisfaction is not measured by the physical action which produces it, but by the dignity of the person to whom it pertains, a dignity which, in this case, is infinite, so that the human operations of Christ, not considered entitatively but morally, and with respect to their satisfactory value, are simply infinite.

On the other hand, the offense should always be measured in relation to the dignity of the person offended and not in relation to the person offending. For this reason, sin is in a certain way infinite, since it is an offense against an infinitely worthy Person. Nevertheless, it is not simply infinite, since its infinity is taken from the object to which it is directed. But the object never affects the action intrinsically, but extrinsically and according to the manner in which the action is directed to it. Since the mode is finite, the action must be of the same nature, although the object which receives it may be simply infinite. Therefore, every sinful act, taking into account the finite manner in which it tends towards its object, is improperly infinite. However, if it is considered as injurious and offensive to God, it surpasses any injury inflicted on a pure creature.

All that we have said concerning vicarious satisfaction by Christ prepares the path we must follow in studying Mary's compassion in relation to her co-satisfaction. Four questions can be presented in this matter: 1) concerning the fact of Marian co-satisfaction; 2) concerning its quality; 3) concerning its extension; and 4) concerning its absolute and comparative excellence.

t h e s i s: *Mary's compassion was true satisfaction or cosatisfaction.*

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Leo XIII says: "On presenting herself to God as the handmaid for the office of His Mother and on consecrating herself entirely to God, in the Temple, together with her Son, she was constituted as His associate in the painful expiation offered by her Son for the sins of the world. It is certain, therefore, that she suffered in the very depths of her soul with His most bitter sufferings and with His torments.

"There stood by the Cross of Jesus His Mother, and so great was the charity of her heart in receiving us as her children, she generously gave her own Son to the justice of God, dying spiritually with Him, pierced by the sword of sorrow."60

St. Pius X states that by reason of the union of sufferings between Christ and Mary, she merited to be the most worthy reparatrix of the whole world.07 Pope Benedict XIV says that Mary suffered to such an extent in union with her Son that we must confess that together with Him she redeemed the human race.08 And Pope Pius XI states that by her sufferings, Mary participated with her Son in the work of redemption.09

Doctors of the Church. St. Bernard says that as man fell by reason of the woman, he has also been raised up by a woman.70 St. Albert the Great explicitly affirms that Mary made satisfaction for original sin.71

Theological Arguments, a) Mary suffered with Christ for the same purpose for which Christ suffered and died, namely, to make reparation for the sins of men and to give God the satisfaction due Him. Therefore, Mary, although dependent on Christ and in her own way, cooperated by her compassion in obtaining this end of appeasing God's justice, offended by mankind.

b) There is nothing lacking in Mary's cooperation to prevent it from being truly satisfactory. First, Mary's many sufferings and sorrows, crowned by her maternal cooperation, possessed both aptitude and satisfactory value. Secondly, Mary was a person pleasing and acceptable to God, as Mother of God, consort of the Redeemer and surpassing every other creature in sanctity. Thirdly, Mary's satisfaction possessed the required solidarity, for although she is not head *of* the human race as Christ is, she is the first and pnncipal member of the mystical body and is therefore particularly suited to

represent the human race and make cosatisfaction, just as she was most suited to represent the human race in giving her consent to the Incarnation. Fourthly, all of her works were directed to the salvation of mankind, for which she ardently longed. Lastly, Mary's sufferings were accepted by God because in decreeing that Mary should be the consort of the Redeemer, He had to accept—at least out of benevolence—her co satisfaction.

c) Mary's satisfaction neither lessens nor is it opposed to that of Christ, but neither did it increase its value, for it is already infinite. Neither did Mary offer *perfect* compensation for sin, as Christ did. Rather, she expiated for sin so far as a human person could, in order to comply with the divine economy by which God willed that Mary should unite her satisfaction with the condign satisfaction of Christ.

t h e s i s: *Whether Mary's satisfaction was condign or congruous.*

It is already established that Mary could not offer strict satisfaction to God because hers was a satisfaction which came from God and was owed to Him under many titles. It is therefore a matter of deciding whether the satisfaction was *condign* or *congruous.* However, we shall not speak of the possibility of Mary's offering condign satisfaction for the sins of men under God's *absolute* power, as is defended by some theologians. Rather, we are dealing with the kind of satisfaction which Mary actually offered according to the ordinary law under the present divine economy.

Opinions, i) The general opinion of theologians up to the present time has been that Mary's satisfaction was not condign but congruous, although in an eminent degree.

The Fathers. Tire Fathers assert that condign satisfaction for sin is the work of the God-Man. This is evidenced by the testimony of St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine and St. Fulgence.[72] Pope Pius XI repeats this in his encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor,* where he says that no created power could have expiated the sins of mankind had not the Son of God assumed human nature in order to redeem it.

Theological Arguments, a) Condign satisfaction is impossible if the dignity of the person offering it is not equal to the dignity of the one offended. The gravity of the injury is always measured by the excellence of the one offended, while reparation is weighed by

the honor and dignity of the one who makes satisfaction, according to a well-known axiom: "Honor is in the one honoring; injury is in the one injured." Now Mary, although surpassing all creatures in dignity, touching the limits of the divine and pertaining to the hypostatic order, is nevertheless a creature and therefore incapable of equating by her works the gravity of the offense against God.

b) The seriousness of the offense against God, according to the opinion of theologians, is either simply infinite or infinite in an improper sense. If it is the first, it is clear that Mary cannot compensate condignly by her work as a pure creature; if it is the second (which is much more probable than the first) neither can any creature offer condign satisfaction, for the dignity of a creature, even adorned with all possible or imaginable graces, could never be equal to the dignity of God, offended by sin.

c) If Mary's compassion was satisfactory but not condign, it follows logically that it was congruous, deficient in itself but benignly accepted by God together with Christ's satisfaction and ordained to the redemption of mankind. St. Thomas teaches that satisfaction may be said to be sufficient in two ways: first, perfectly, inasmuch as it is condign and is therefore adequate to make good the fault committed, and in this way the satisfaction of a mere man cannot be sufficient for sin; secondly, satisfaction may be sufficient imperfectly, that is, by the acceptance of the satisfaction even though it is not condign, and in this way the satisfaction of a mere man is sufficient. And since everything imperfect presupposes something perfect, by which it is sustained, the satisfaction of a mere man has its efficacy from the satisfaction of Christ.[73]

Salazar teaches that the statement of St. Bernard to the effect that Mary made satisfaction to the Father for the mother (Eve), signifies that by her merits Mary offered congruous satisfaction.[74] Guevara states that whereas no angel or human being could offer satisfaction condignly, as Christ did, Mary offered to God the Father a congruous price by shedding her blood spiritually for the salvation of all men. Hence, as divine wisdom decreed to accept the death of the Son as condign payment of human redemption, so the passion of Mary in offering her Son was accepted as congruous payment.[75]

2) Other theologians, whose number has been increasing in recent years, maintain that Mary was able to make satisfaction and actually

did make satisfaction condignly, although not a perfect and rigorously condign satisfaction. Among the theologians supporting this opinion are Vega, del Moral, Cuervo, Llamcra and Aldama. The principal foundations for their opinion are the following:

a) The teaching of the Fathers and Doctors is not opposed to Mary's condign satisfaction, because in stating that only Christ can offer condign satisfaction, they are referring to perfect and rigorously condign satisfaction.

b) There is a twofold relationship in satisfaction: that of the satisfier to the one offended and that of the satisfactory work to the offense. In perfect and rigorously condign satisfaction there is an equation in both of the relationships, but in relatively condign satisfaction there is an equation only between the reparatory work and the offense. But it is certain that this latter equation exists between Mary's satisfaction and the offense, because the offense against God is not infinite *simpliciter* but only *secundum quid,* and Mary's satisfaction, because of her divine maternity by which she pertains to the hypostatic order, is likewise infinite *secundum quid.*

c) Mary's condign satisfaction is made possible and is even demanded by her lofty dignity as Mother of God and of men and by her association with her Son in the redemption of the human race.

t h e s i s: *The extent of Mary's co-satisfaction.*

Mary's co-satisfaction was as universal as was Christ's, since Mary suffered with Christ for the redemption of mankind with the same love and will with which He willed the salvation of all, paying the price of our ransom by His death. Nevertheless, the teaching of the Council of Trent (Sess. VI, c. 3) must be kept in mind: "But, though He died for all, yet not all receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His passion is communicated." 76

Christ died for all men, and His death had the sufficiency to save all, but in reality it is efficaciously profitable only for those to whom it is applied. This is what St. Thomas teaches: "Christ's death is the universal cause of salvation, just as the sin of the first man was the universal cause of damnation. Now a universal cause needs to be applied to each individual, so that he may share in the effect of the universal cause. Accordingly, as the effect of the first sin reaches each

man through carnal generation, the effect of Christ's passion reaches each individual through spiritual generation, whereby man is united to and incorporated with Christ. Therefore, each one must seek to be regenerated by Christ and to receive all those things in which the power of Christ's death lives and works effectively."[77]

Hence it follows that Christ's death should be considered under two aspects: considering its *intrinsic force or power,* including the antecedent will of Christ, disposed to die, and of His Father, sending Him into the world for this purpose, or considering the *fruit and effects of His death* and the will which is called consequent. In conformity with the first, Christ certainly died for all men, since His death was of itself sufficiently meritorious to free all, but if one considers the effect actually produced, not all are saved, but only those who voluntarily use and avail themselves of the means of salvation, merited by Christ for all. And the reason is that the practical effect of redemption is not only dependent on Christ's will, but also on the will of those who are to be saved, accepting the benefits of redemption offered by Him to all. Therefore, those who voluntarily reject this benefit cannot be saved.[78]

It was in this same manner that Mary cooperated in the redemption of all men, offering her satisfaction in union with the satisfaction of her Son. However, Mary did not satisfy equally for all, as regards the effect of her satisfaction, but only for those who, accepting the benefits of the redemption, are united with Christ and thus become her spiritual children.

t h e s i s: *The excellence of Mary's satisfaction considered absolutely.*

In considering the immensity of Christ's satisfaction, St. Thomas states three reasons for its excellence: the immense charity which led Him to His death, the dignity of His life, the life of a God-Man, given in satisfaction, and the universality of the Passion and the magnitude of His sufferings.[70] Observing the proper proportion, these same reasons may be applied to the satisfaction made by Mary, the Mother of God.

i) *Because of her dignity.* Mary is the Mother of God, and for that reason her dignity is in proportion to one who touches upon the divine and enters into the hypostatic order. She is also most

holy, absolutely free of all sin and filled beyond compare with all possible graces. Since she had no need to make any satisfaction for herself, she was always in the best possible situation to offer satisfaction for others.

2) *Because of the magnitude of her charity.* Her most pure love was directed to God, to Jesus Christ her Son, and to the entire human race. St. Robert Bellarmine states that if the greatest love is to lay down one's life for one's friends, how great was Mary's love when she gave the life of her Son for her friends, a Son whom she loved more than her own life.[80] Richard of St. Victor remarks that Mary's love was so great that it extended not only to her own race but to all the persons in the world, both known and unknown.[81]

3) *Because of the magnitude of her suffering.* Mary was truly Queen of martyrs and co-martyr with Christ. St. Amadeus states that there are two kinds of martyrdom: one visible and the other invisible, one external and the other internal, one of the body and the other of the soul. The Blessed Virgin excelled in the second kind of martyrdom, which is even more intense because it is more intimate to one's very being. She was united with Christ's suffering to such an extent that there has never been any suffering like hers.[82]

t h e s i s: *Mary's satisfaction in comparison with that of Christ and the saints.*

1) Christ's satisfaction is absolutely first, that is, it is anterior to any other satisfaction made by any other person and to such an extent that without tire satisfaction by Christ, there could be no other satisfaction whatever. Mary's satisfaction, being second and posterior to that of Christ, is nevertheless the first in relation to the satisfaction made by any other creature. Her satisfaction rests on that of Christ, from which it receives its intrinsic value; that of others received its value both from the satisfaction of Christ and that of Mary. Therefore, all other satisfaction other than that of Christ and Mary' is second and posterior to that of Christ and Mary.

2) With regard to its object, Christ's satisfaction is simply universal, so that it extends to all men, to all sins and even to their punishments, with the sole exception of Mary, for whom He could not satisfy' so far as any sin was concerned, for she was completely free from original and actual sin. Moreover, it was not even necessary

for any satisfaction with regard to the proximate debt of original sin, but only as regards the remote debt of this sin, which could or would have been contracted.[83] That satisfaction enabled Mary to be entirely free from sin and from the proximate debt of sin.

But this universal satisfaction of Christ's must be understood, as we said before, with regard to its sufficiency and not its efficacy, since each and every man was not reconciled to God because of Christ's satisfaction, but only those to whom it was applied through the means of salvation instituted by Christ. Exception is made of those who have not yet reached the use of reason, for they are not capable of personal cooperation.

Similarly, it is universal by its influence on the satisfaction of others, so that all other satisfactions are adorned by the efficacy and dignity possessed by the satisfaction of Christ.

Mary's satisfaction was also universal in a certain way, as regards the object, since, united to that of Christ, it was the universal repairer of all the sins of men and of the punishment due to them. It likewise influenced the satisfaction of individuals, whose value derives from the satisfaction of Mary, united to that of Christ.

3) The satisfaction of other men is limited and particular. In regard to satisfaction for sin and the eternal punishment due, no one can offer a compensation by his own actions that would effect a total extinction of the debt, although by the grace which Christ gained by His merits and satisfactions, one's imperfect compensation can dispose one to merit *de congruo* reconciliation with God and a pardon of eternal punishment.

We prescind from satisfaction for venial sin, on which theologians do not agree, although the greater number maintain that the just man can satisfy condignly for venial sin. Nevertheless, these sins, as Lugo says,[81] are rarely or never repaired by a condign satisfaction, because they are very frequent and none of the just, even those constituted in heroic sanctity, can offer satisfaction to such a degree that he does not at every moment need divine remission nor to repeat daily the words of the Lord's prayer: "Forgive us our trespasses."

As regards the temporal punishment which remains after sin is forgiven, the just man can satisfy condignly to divine justice, not only for himself but for others, as is stated in the *Roman Catechism.w*

Finally, all satisfactions of the just are such through Jesus Christ from whose satisfaction they receive their efficacy; that is, not only are the satisfactions proper to Christ applied to temporal punishment, but the personal actions of the just possess satisfactory merit and actually satisfy, but always in Christ and through Christ. But it cannot be said that our satisfaction is added to that of Christ's, as though His divine blood had not of itself been sufficient to appease the justice of God for all of our debt. It is simply that Christ, in order to apply the price of redemption, willed to communicate to His members the power of satisfying for themselves in the manner shown. In this way the glory of the Redeemer shines forth more brilliantly and His divine satisfaction is more resplendent, for it is shown to be the more abundant and efficacious when His power of satisfaction reaches us and makes us collaborators with Him. Thus, the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, c. 9) explains that we can glory in nothing of ourselves, but all our glory is in Christ, in whom we live, merit and repair, reaping worthy fruits of penance which receive their power from Him, are offered to the Father and are accepted by the Father through Him.

4) All that we say concerning the condign satisfaction of Christ—that it, as the fountain of salvation, lends dignity and greatness to that of man—can also be said of Mary's satisfaction, united to that of Christ, from which, as from another fountain with a distinct value and by a different title, our satisfactions also receive their dignity and power.

MERITORIOUS ASPECT OF MARY'S COOPERATION

Merit is any good work worthy of a reward. Merit is distinct from satisfaction. Merit tends to the attainment of the reward from him in whose favor the work is done. Satisfaction intends the reparation of another's right by paying what is due. Satisfaction and merit are not necessarily numerically distinct acts, but one and the same act can be both satisfactory' and meritorious.

Merit is of two kinds: condign and congruous. Condign merit supposes and requires equality between the meritorious work and the reward expected from it. Condign merit must possess a special per-

fection if a reward is to be exacted in strict justice; it must not only equal the reward, but it must conform to the conditions of strict justice.

Congruous merit is that which is not equal to the reward, but possesses a certain proportion to it, so that the one who is to reward is obligated by fittingness and convenience. Condign merit is based on justice and the reward is owed in justice, but congruous merit is based solely on the goodness of the one bestowing the reward, out of liberality or friendship with the one meriting, but not to the point that all proportion to a reward is lacking.

Hence it is that since congruous merit is not based on equality but on the friendship of the one bestowing the reward with the one meriting it, it admits of many degrees and can vary to the point of being congruous merit improperly speaking, since the friendship on which it is based is sometimes only improper. Thus, objectively good works performed in the state of mortal sin are called congruous merit in the improper sense, for they are founded on a certain analogy of friendship and therefore possess a certain congruous merit.[80]

St. Bonaventure made a threefold classification of merit: *de condigno, de digno* and *de congruo.* He would call merit *de digno* that work which is neither equal to nor possesses of itself the dignity corresponding to the reward, but it obtains that dignity through the goodness of God, who accepts a certain work for a certain determined reward. However, this third classification is rejected almost unanimously by theologians and the common teaching is that merit is either equal to the reward, and then it is merit *de condigno,* or it is not equal to the reward, and then it is merit *de congruo.*[91]

Still another type of merit which has been proposed by theologians is *imperative* merit, which refers to a work which possesses the power to incline the superior or authority to give a fitting reward. In impétration materially considered, in addition to the merit proper to the supplication, there can be merit *de condigno,* or merit *de congruo,* but taken in its proper formality, the distinction is complete because impétration is related to mercy, merit *de condigno* is related to justice, and mprit *de congruo* is related to friendship or benevolent equity-. ..

According to many theologians, Christ merited *de condigno,* and even in strict justice, by each and every act He performed during

the whole of His mortal life. Nevertheless, these works were neither offered by Christ nor accepted by the Father as meritorious except as having to be completed by His death. Because of the infinite dig nit}' of His person, each and every act of Christ was complete and perfect merit *de condigno,* but as related to the fruit of redemption, His acts had to be crowned by death as the termination and consummation of those acts, not as a series, but in the formal aspect of merit.

And thus St. Thomas says that any suffering undergone by Christ, even without death, would have sufficed for the redemption of the human race, if it had been ordained to that end, on account of the dignity of His person, but no other suffering less than Christ's death was deemed sufficient by God the Father and by Christ Himself to redeem the human race.88

Christ could merit for Himself none of those things by which He was constituted in His own being or which served as the principle or source of all His merits, such as His incarnation, the grace of union, created grace with its supernatural habits and the beatific vision. But He could merit whatever was not due Him through the Incarnation, such as the glorification of His body, the impassibility of His soul, the exaltation of His name and so on. For that reason the Apostle said: "He humbled Himself, becoming obedient to death, even to death on a cross. Therefore God also has exalted Him and has bestowed upon Him the name that is above every name, so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bend of those in heaven, on earth and under the earth, and every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father." 88

Christ merited *de condigno for* men all the graces and supernatural means necessary in order to gain salvation and, therefore, the pardon of sins, the state of grace and of glory, all the gifts which precede and dispose for justification, all those which are bestowed afterwards, all the effects of predestination and even predestination itself. Hence the Apostle states: "And when perfected, He became to all who obey Him the cause of eternal salvation." 80 And in the Acts of the Apostles: "For there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved." 81 Hence it follows that no one obtained the remission of sins, no one received grace or was crowned with glory, except through the merits of Christ. Even those

who lived before the coming of Christ were given the means necessary for salvation in view of the merits of the Redeemer who was to come.

Taking into consideration what has been said, we pass on to a study of the cooperation of Mary in redemption under its meritorious aspect. The whole doctrine can be reduced to these four questions: first, the existence of merit in Mary; second, its quality; third, its extent; and fourth, its excellence.

t h e s i s: *Mary cooperated in the redemption of the human race meritoriously.*

We have already demonstrated that Mary merited throughout her entire life, beginning at the first moment of her immaculate conception. Hence, we arc not concerned here with recognizing her merits previous to the Incarnation, which were preparatory to her divine maternity and to her cooperation in human redemption, but rather with studying those which she obtained since the incarnation of the Word, and especially in her maternal compassion, near the cross of her dying Son. We shall leave aside the statements of those theologians who maintain that Mary suffered her compassion all during her life, since she knew from the moment of the Incarnation that her Son would die on the cross.82

Opinions. Snme modem theologians deny that Mary cooperated proximately by her merits in objective redemption.

M. De la Taille says that Mary did not merit her own redemption either *de condigno* or *de congruo.* Hence, neither did she merit ours, for there was one redemption only for the whole human race.83

G. D. Smith considers Mary's immediate cooperation in objective redemption impossible, limiting her to the dispensation of its fruits and thus meriting to apply them to herself and to the rest of men. Therefore, he believes that Mary's co-redemptive activity is of the same order as ours.8.1

G. Philips, having denied Mary's immediate cooperation in objective redemption, says that she cooperated in subjective redemption in two ways: in suffering at the foot of the Cross, where she obtained the merits of universal distribution through the efficacy of the Passion and, in consequence thereof, in assisting by her intercession in the actual distribution of the treasury of graces.83

The following theologians are also of this opinion: Billot, Ude, Rivière, Lennerz and Goossens. However, the majority of theologians maintain that Mary cooperated immediately in objective redemption by the merit of her compassion.

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Sixtus V proclaimed the outstanding merits of the Blessed Virgin in behalf of the human race[M] and Pope Leo XIII recalls "the singular merits by which Mary shared with her Son in human redemption. . . . At which mysteries she was not only present, but she intervened in them." [97]

St. Pius X stated: "Since Mary surpassed all in holiness and union with Christ and was associated with Him in the work of human salvation, she merits for us *de congruo,* as they say, all that Christ merits *de condigno." [88]*

Now, these words of the Pontiff must be understood in regard to objective redemption, since Mary, united to Christ and under His dependency as the one who merited all graces, also merited them, and not only as regards subjective redemption or the application of graces. St. Pius X expressly says that Mary merited *de congruo* what Christ merited *de condigno.* Since Christ merited for us all the graces necessary for salvation, it follows that Mary's merits had to extend to all and not merely to their application. Also, the Pontiff speaks, undoubtedly, of Mary's merit while on earth, although he uses the verb *to merit* in the present tense (as is done frequently to designate a past action) since in heaven one cannot merit, but can only intercede, and in its formal concept this does not admit of *de congruo* and *de condigno.*

It is clear from the context that the Pope is referring to Mary's compassion at the foot of the Cross: "From this communion of sufferings and wills between Christ and Mary' she merited to become the most worthy reparatrix of the fallen world and therefore the dispensatrix of all the gifts that Jesus acquired by His death and His blood." This refers to Mary's merit *de congruo* by her compassion on earth, where she merited two things: to be reparatrix of the human race and dispensatrix of the graces merited by Christ.

Finally, the Pontiff seems to confirm the almost common opinion of theologians who since the sixteenth century have been speaking of Mary's cooperation in redemption by her merits, thus giving us

an axiom commonly admitted by all: Mary merited for us *de congruo* all that Christ merited *de condigno."*

Among theologians, it is a general doctrine that Mary's merits refer not only to subjective redemption but also to objective redemption, as can be seen in the works of Novatus, Vega, Guevara, Salazar. Garâu, Rhodes and almost all the modems. It was also affirmed by the Franciscan School in the words of Father Leonard Mary Bello, General of the Order: "All the gifts that Christ merited *de condigno were* merited at least *de congruo* by the Virgin Queen. This is the thought of the Marian doctors of our School since the beginning of the sixteenth century." [100] Therefore it is unlikely that St. Pius X intended to give a different interpretation from that commonly given in Scholastic theology.

Fathers and Doctors of the Church. St. Augustine refers to Mary as "author of merit";[101] Eadmer states that Mary "restored all things by her merits";[102] St. Albert the Great says that Mary's Son rewarded her by communicating to her the merits of His passion;[108] St. Bonaventure declares that Mary merited principally in the passion of her Son by suffering with Him as much as her strength would permit.'[04]

Theological Argument. Mary was united to Christ in the work of Redemption, as we have said many times. This union presupposes in her a cooperation consisting in the exercise of free actions, in which, particularly from the time of her consent to the Incarnation to her compassion near the Cross, we observe the characteristic marks of merit in relation to human salvation. Those free actions were not only good, but perfect, directed to God under the influence of the most ardent charity and inflamed with a desire for human redemption, for which reason she was given to Christ as companion. Therefore, Mary's cooperation was truly meritorious.

This merit on Mary's part is not opposed nor derogatory to Christ's redemptive merit, because it is absolutely subordinate to His and receives its efficacy from His. Herein is realized what St. Thomas says: "Everything imperfect presupposes something perfect by which it is sustained."[10B]

Neither is it maintained that Mary's merits were necessary to complete those of Christ. His were not only sufficient, but superabundant

and infinite, and nothing can be added to what is infinite. We say, therefore, that Mary's merits concur in redemption congruously and dispositively, thus completing the economy of redemption, which was to be effected by the merits of Christ, to which were united the merits of Mary.

But here a difficulty arises in opposition to the merit of the Virgin. According to the well-known axiom, the beginning of merit cannot be merited. If the beginning of Mary's merit was objective redemption itself, or Christ's redemptive work on the Cross, by which all grace was merited for Mary and for the rest of mankind, it cannot be understood how Mary could cooperate meritoriously in this redemption which is necessary for all grace and also for any cooperation in redemption.

The following must be taken into consideration for the solution of this difficulty:

a) Redemption is the principle of Mary's merit, and, therefore, Christ's merit is anterior to that of His Mother by a priority of nature and causality, even if they existed simultaneously and even if Mary's merit were prior in time to objective redemption.

b) This priority of merit with respect to the reward is not a priority in the order of execution since, absolutely speaking, it is not required that merit *actually* exist before the reward; a priority in intention suffices, that is, that it pre-exist in the mind of the one who is to give the reward.

c) Therefore, Christ's merit did not *actually* and effectively exist before that of Mary, with a priority of nature, because in reality even before objective redemption existed in act, Mary merited by her consent to the Incarnation, which is the beginning of hpman redemption; but it did exist *in intention,* since Christ's merits were anterior in the divine foreknowledge, in view of which God bestowed grace upon Mary' in advance for her complete sanctity, thus redeeming her in a most sublime way and giving her the fittingness necessary for participating in the redemption of the rest of men.

d) There is, then, no inconvenience whatever in distinguishing two instances in divine foreknowledge and in the predestination of the incarnation of tire Word: one, by which God willed Christ as the Redeemer bom of the Blessed Virgin and willed that she be redeemed by His merits; the other, by which He decreed that Mary, as

the new Eve, should be associated with Christ, the new Adam, in the work of redemption. It is not absurd to designate in the simplest act of divine foreknowledge and will, various instants which connote various objects, because this is equivalent to designating those objects as distinct so far as they are willed by God.[108] And certainly, Mary's divine maternity and association in redemption are two formally distinct objects, on which the distinction of those two instances in the divine decrees may be based.

Hence, we conclude that, prescinding from the actual unity of the redemption, we may distinguish a redemption by which Christ redeemed His Mother and the other by which He redeemed the rest of men, with Mary cooperating in this latter by her satisfaction and merit. Let us recall the explanation of Ambrose Catharinus on this subject. Pursuing the resemblance existing between Adam and Christ, and Eve and Mary, he distinguishes three modes of corporal generation, to which correspond three modes of spiritual generation. Adam was produced by God alone, having the earth as his mother; Eve proceeds from Adam alone, without any mother; and the rest of men are produced by a father and a mother. In the same manner, Christ was bom of Mary by the operation of God; Mary was bom spiritually of the rib of Christ, while He slept on the Cross, and the rest of men are regenerated spiritually by Christ and Mary.[107]

t h e s i s: *Mary cooperated meritoriously in our salvation, meriting graces for us, not* de condigno *but* de congruo.

This question is proposed in conformity with the present economy of redemption or the ordinary law, without taking into account the absolute power of God or what He could do in another order of providence distinct from the present one.

Opinions. There are two theological opinions on this question. Until recent times it was the common teaching that Mary did not merit the graces of redemption *de condigno,* but only *de congruo,* although in an eminent degree. Now, however, no few theologians defend the teaching that Mary merited by some type of merit *de condigno.*

Among the theologians who defend Mary's co-redemptive condign merit are Charles del Moral, A. Fernandez, Ripalda, Vega, Lebon, Leloir, Bittremieux, Cuervo, Balic, Garcia Garces, Llamera, Bover

and Aldama. The principal arguments on which they base their teaching are the following:

a) The statement of St. Pius X, which attributes merit *de condigno* to Christ and only merit *de congruo* to Mary, is not an argument against the opinion which holds for Mary's merit *de condigno,* because the Pope's intention was simply to stress Mary's universal merit and place it on a level inferior to that of Christ. He merely used the terminology which was commonly in use.

b) Christ is the God-Man, and as such He is Head of all men; and Mary, since she is the Mother of the Head of all men, is the spiritual Mother of men. But the spiritual maternity or maternal grace is to the co-redemptive merit what the headship or capital grace is to the redemptive merit of Christ. Now, in virtue of His headship, Christ merited grace for the human race by an absolutely *de condigno* merit. Therefore, Mary, in virtue of her spiritual maternity, co-merited grace for the human race *de condigno ex condignitate.*

c) The maternal merit of Mary contains all the conditions required for merit *de condigno:* the plenitude of grace, the moral representative of the entire human race as the new Eve and mediatrix whose grace virtually contains the grace of all men, intrinsic ordination of her maternal grace to the acquisition of grace for all her children, extrinsic ordination by God's will which predestined her to the redemption and regeneration of men in union with Christ and dependent upon Him. Therefore, the merit of Mary is rightly called *maternal condign* merit, the merit of Christ is *capital* and *absolute condign* merit and the merit of Christians in general is merely congruous merit.

The greater majority of theologians, however, maintain that Mary merited for us the graces of redemption by her merits, not *de condigno,* but *de congruo.*

First Part, a) It was proper and exclusive of Christ, as Head and Author of our salvation, to merit grace and eternal life *de condigno* for all men. Thus, St. Thomas says that God moves us by His grace so that each one can attain eternal life, and therefore merit *de condigno* cannot be extended beyond this divine movement. But Christ's soul was moved by that grace, not only that He would reach the glory of life everlasting, but that He could lead others to the same glory, as Head of the Church and Author of human salvation.[108]

Certainly God also moved Mary with His grace so that she might attain glory and could lead others to glory, not as the influencing Head, but like a communicating neck; not as the Author of salvation, but as an assistant of Christ. As the Angelic Doctor says, the Blessed Virgin, though being in no way the author of grace, caused hers to redound to us (In *Joan.,* I, lect. 2).

b) In order that one in the state of grace be able to merit for others *de condigno,* it is necessary that he be united to God, the first and only Cause of all grace, in a singular and most exalted manner. We already know that all men, with the exception of Christ, are united to God in specifically the same way through adoptive filiation. Merit *de condigno* is therefore impossible in anyone else.[109]

In this respect St. Augustine says that a great difference exists between the Head and the other members, for the divinity dwells in the members but not as it dwells in Christ, the Head, where the divinity is present in all its fullness.[110]

Hence, all theologians, with few exceptions, affirm that the grace of union, together with habitual grace, are necessary that Christ might be constituted Head of men. Even more, some maintain that the grace of union alone is what formally constitutes this dignity. Thus, Vazquez says that Christ's capital grace is the grace of union. Suarez, Lugo, Lorca and, among the modems, Stentrup, maintain that Christ's capital grace is primarily that of the hypostatic union and, secondarily, habitual grace.

The Thomists generally, such as John of St. Thomas, Medina, Araujo, Gonet, the Salmanticenses and others, teach that habitual grace is the formal and proximate constitutive of Christ as Head and that the grace of union is the prerequisite and root of that dignity.

Philip of the Most Holy Trinity, whom Bartmann follows, affirms that capital grace, taken formally, is none other than the power given to Christ by God in order to influence the spiritual life and actions of the members of the Church; but for Christ to use that power and exercise those acts, He needed the grace of union together with habitual or sanctifying grace.[111]

For that reason all theologians say that if the grace of union did

not enter as a constituent element of capital grace, a pure creature could be, absolutely speaking, Head of the Church as is Christ, i thing which is impossible under the present divine economy. Ai Scotus says, divine wisdom established certain laws, according to which, one alone will always be the Head of the Church to whom all His members owe their graces."?

Father Gregory Martinez summarizes this doctrine by saying that to merit the first grace for another belongs to a capital and infinite grace. No man as such could possess this grace, and therefore it is impossible for any man to merit the first grace *de condigno* for an other.113 This same line of reasoning likewise proves the impossibility of a pure creature meriting the second grace *de condigno* for others, as we shall see.

c) In order to be able to assert that Mary's merit in the work of our redemption is really condign, it is necessary first to prove its possibility and then the fact of the divine preordination by which God destined Mary's works to merit *de condigno* the graces of redemption for others.

In neither of these two cases are theologians agreed. As to the first, the possibility of Mary's merit *de condigno* with respect to others seems to be founded on this: that within the absolute power of God, any man in the state of sanctifying grace can merit *de condigno* the first grace for another and, moreover, since the power of excellence proper to Christ is communicable, he could be constituted by God as head of others, though secondarily, and thus could be conferred on him the most excellent grace of meriting for all the others. But this possibility of meriting *de condigno* for others on the part of any man whatever, is completely doubtful. While some assert it explicitly, like Soto and Gonet, and others see no absolute contradiction, like John of St. Thomas, some expressly deny it, among whom is Valencia, who explains that neither Scripture nor the Church declares it.11* Cardinal Gotti and Araujo maintain that only Christ can be the Head of the Church, because no pure creature can merit *de condigno* the grace of forgiveness of sins, since condign merit for another requires an infinite efficacy, and this is proper to the merit which proceeds from a divine person.

Secondly, the divine ordination to merit *de condigno* is twofold: the *intrinsic* ordination which is included as a principle of merit in

the conferring grace (in this case God, who by the very fact of conferring grace obliges Himself to reward the merits attained through grace) and the *extrinsic* ordination which proceeds from a positive law or promise of God, by which He expressly decrees to confer grace as a principle of merit and obliges Himself to reward the works executed under the influence of that grace.

Theologians commonly require, besides the intrinsic ordination of God, the extrinsic ordination of God, since the just man does not merit any reward unless God promises one. The reason is that every merit includes a right; but man has no right unless God obliges Himself to grant a reward, and apart from His promise, God is never obliged to reward what is already due by an infinity of titles. Hence the Council of Sens asserted that the justice of our merits is not based on absolute condignity but on the gratuitous and liberal promise of God.113

Now, the intrinsic ordination of the grace of the Blessed Virgin, as with the rest of creatures, docs not suffice to merit *de condigno* for others, but only for herself. Condign merit proceeds from the intrinsic ordination of grace to the reward, but a finite grace, which is that found in a creature, does not in itself possess that ordination to merit the reward of grace for others, because the grace of a creature, however lofty, is always perfected in relation to the subject of grace and not to another, nor does its intrinsic ordination look to the good of another.

Moreover, there is no particular and explicit ordination of God whereby Mary can merit condignly for others, as is proved by the absolute silence on the subject in Scripture and Tradition. And it may not be said that this special ordination of God is contained implicitly in the decree which constituted Mary as co-redemptrix and mediatrix, because there is no solid argument to prove it and such offices of the Mother of God are perfectly defended by the eminence of her merit *de congruo*.

Second Part. St. Pius X says that since Mary surpassed all in holiness and union with Christ and was associated with Christ in the work of redemption, she merits for us *de congruo* what Christ merits *de condigno*.119

Merit *de congruo* is based on the proportion of friendship and love. According to St. Thomas, if a man in the state of grace fulfills

the will of God, it is fitting that in accordance with that friendship that God should fulfill the will of that man in regard to the salvation of another person, though it can happen that at times there will be an obstacle on the part of the person whose salvation is desired. And that proportion of friendship and charity was surely given in a most excellent manner when Mary, at the foot of the Cross, suffered and almost died with her Son. The reason is that at that time, as St. Albert the Great says (*Mariale,* q. 149), her charity was greatest. Moreover, she fulfilled the will of God most perfectly by submitting to the decree and will of the Father, who gave His Son for the redemption of the world, and she was perfectly united to the will of her Son when she shared His sufferings and His desire for the salvation of the human race.

Nor does meriting grace *de congruo for* men imply any inconvenience in Mary's office in the work of human redemption. In objective redemption Mary is not redemptrix, but an associate or assistant of the Redeemer, and therefore their merits differ infinitely. In subjective redemption Mary is not the Head, as is Christ, but the neck or channel through which the graces flow from the Head, and although she intervenes in the distribution of grace, she does so in a different manner.

The principle of all merit is grace, but to merit for others and to bestow heavenly gifts that have been merited belongs to capital grace, which presupposes in the one meriting a superiority and eminence of grace, because the agent is superior to the patient.[117] Christ and Mary possessed a grace superior to that in the rest of men, but Christ's is capital grace, while Mary's is not, although hers may be called universal or social, because it was given to her as a universal principle of sanctification, whose office is to work with Christ the Head, and subordinate to Him, in the distribution of grace in all men.

But the eminence of grace is twofold. One is *intensive,* from which it does not follow that it can cause grace, except by a certain congruence and free divine acceptation, and in this way any just man can merit grace for others. The other eminence is *infinite in moral perfection,* derived from union with the Word, and this is the excellence of the grace of Christ to merit condignly and to cause

grace and glory in others according to His will. God the Father infallibly accepts such merit, causality or influence.

From this one can see clearly by what kind of eminence Mary is the universal principle of sanctification for men. It is not that which results from the hypostatic union, which is proper only to Christ, but is the eminence of intensity, wherein she incomparably surpasses all the saints and through which she merits *de congruo,* presupposing the free divine acceptance, all graces and their distribution to all men. Therefore, although Mary surpasses all in sanctity, is most loved by God and in some way enters into the order of the hypostatic union, it is proper to Christ alone to merit condignly all graces for all men.

thesis: *The extent of Mary's merit.*

Previous Observations. It is hardly necessary to mention that the following graces do not pertain to the object of Marian merit: whatever Christ merited for Himself alone, such as His glorification, the exaltation of His name, etc.; the first grace given to Mary, by which she received the power of meriting with Christ (since the principle of merit cannot be merited) and the other prerogatives that Christ merited for her alone.

In this question we are treating of Mary's merit for others, and not for herself, since she merited for herself condignly whatever any other creature can merit for himself. But Mary's merit may be considered in general and in particular. If it is considered in general, we can say, with respect to its extent, that Mary merited for us *de congruo* whatever Christ merited for us *de condigno.* The words of St. Pius X, namely, that Mary merited for us *de congruo* whatever Christ merited *de condigno,* must be understood as referring to the meriting of graces, and not to their mere application.

Moreover, the whole economy of redemption rests on Christ's merits as Redeemer, and to that economy are related all the benefits which in any way are connected with human salvation. Now Mary was given the office of cooperating universally in the work of redemption, in union with the Redeemer, by her merits. Therefore, she merited for us in her way whatever Christ merited for us condignly.

Lastly, Mary desired the salvation of men with the same love with which Christ offered His death for their salvation, thus meriting for everyone the graces necessary- in order to attain salvation. And if Christ merited them condingly, then Mary also had to merit them in some way.[118] But it is fitting to study the object of Marian merit in particular in order to see which supernatural gifts it comprises.

The gifts of grace conferred on men through Christ's merits may be reduced to four kinds: i) the remission of sins, sanctifying grace and glory'; 2) the assistance of grace by which man disposes himself for justification; 3) all graces conferred on man after justification; 4) predestination. Therefore, the object of Marian merit can be summarized in the following statements:

1) *The Blessed Virgin merited for us* de congruo *the remission of original and personal sins, sanctifying grace and glory.*

St. Cyril of Alexandria addresses Mary as the Virgin through whom baptism was given to the faithful.[118] St. John Damascene hails the Blessed Virgin as the one who erased the punishment of our transgression.[120] It should be noted that Mary's merit extends also to the remission of venial sins, because if they can be forgiven only through the grace of Christ, there can be no doubt that Mary also obtained their remission through her merit.

As she merited for us sanctifying grace, without which the forgiveness of original and personal mortal sin is impossible, Mary also merited for us the infused virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which necessarily accompany sanctifying grace.

Since Adam and Eve introduced sin into the world and thereby closed the gates of heaven to all their descendants, it was fitting that Mary, by uniting her merits with those of Christ, should open the gates to all men and thus merit glory for them.

2) *The Blessed Virgin merited for us all the helps of grace necessary to dispose us for justification.*

St. Cyril of Alexandria says that those who were in the shadows of error have been brought to the light of truth and the grace of baptism through Mary.[121] Nevertheless it should be noted that Mary did not merit these preparatory helps for all souls equally. She merited *sufficient* helps for all, but *efficacious* helps only for some.

Moreover, for some she merited ordinary helps and for others she merited extraordinary helps.

3) *The Blessed Virgin merited for us all the supernatural gifts which follow justification.*

The principal supernatural gifts which follow justification are: a) final perseverance, b) the increase of grace and glory, c) the remission of temporal punishment due to sin.

There is no difficulty in asserting that Mary merited for us the increase of grace and glory, together with the acts which lead to this increase, since Christ as Head has merited all this for us. The Council of Trent teaches that Christ infuses the power which precedes, accompanies and follows the good works of men and without this power from Christ, none of these works could be meritorious or pleasing to God.[122] Therefore it follows that the Blessed Virgin also merited these things for us.

The same principle applies to the remission or lessening of the temporal punishment due to sin, which is granted through our works of satisfaction, the gaining of indulgences or the other good works which the living apply to the dead. However, the penalty which is paid by the condign satisfaction of the souls in purgatory is not an effect of the merit of Mary, nor even of the merit of Christ, because the souls in purgatory pay all that they owe, even if they suffer less than they deserve.[123]

As regards Mary's merit in relation to the final perseverance of the just, it is necessary to distinguish between *potential* and *actual* perseverance. Potential perseverance or the power to persevere is obtained with sanctifying grace and the helps which follow; actual perseverance requires a special gift of God which the Council of Trent calls "the great gift of perseverance to the end."[124]

All the just, fortified as they are with the special helps of grace, have the potency or power to persevere, that is, they can persevere to the end if they cooperate faithfully with the graces given; but the act of final perseverance is granted only to those who die in the state of grace and thus attain eternal life. But the truth of the matter is that the Blessed Virgin merited for us the helps of grace so that we would be able to persevere and she has also merited for us final perseverance itself.

It is evident that the Blessed Virgin merited for us the helps of grace necessary to be able to persevere because: a) The helps of grace to be able to persevere in the grace of justification and to attain eternal life are demanded by sanctifying grace because sanctifying grace gives the right to eternal life and by that very fact the right to all the graces necessary to reach it. Consequently, Mary must have merited those auxiliary graces for us in the same manner that she merited sanctifying grace for us.

b) In meriting sanctifying grace for us together with Christ, Mary merited it for us with the intention that it be preserved in us perpetually, because Christ and Mary are always in accord with the will of God, who justifies man with the desire that he persevere always in holiness. But if Mary merited justification for men with that intention, she must have merited for men the possibility of perseverance, which requires the auxiliary graces.

The Blessed Virgin also merited actual perseverance, a) Pope Benedict XV declared that we should hope in Mary for the grace of a holy death.1"5 But a holy death is death in the state of grace, which is actual final perseverance, b) Moreover, Mary merited for us eternal happiness, and therefore she must have merited for the elect the actual perseverance which is necessary to attain it. c) Lastly, actual perseverance is inseparably united with divine predestination, and without it, its effect would not be produced in the elect. But predestination is contained in the object of Mary's merit, and therefore actual perseverance is also merited by the Blessed Virgin.

4) As *regards Mary's merit in relation to the predestination of the elect,* we must admit that the question is a very complicated one. It is one thing to consider Mary's merit in relation to the effects of predestination, and it is quite another to consider it so far as it pertains to tire very act of predestination. All theologians agree that Christ is the meritorious cause of all the effects of predestination because He merited *de condigno* for all men from the first grace to glory. The same extent must be granted to the merit of the Blessed Virgin.

The present question, however, pertains to the divine decree by which God predestined only certain souls to eternal life. It is not necessary to remark that we are not treating of the act of predestination entitatively (for that is the divine essence itself, which has no cause of any kind), but we are discussing predestination in its *terminative* signification, that is, in its tendency to the external object. In this sense we arc asking whether the foreseen merits of Christ and His Mother could have moved God to the predestination of the elect.

The prevision of original sin must be presupposed in this question because, as Hericc says: "If predestination was inchoate in Adam before sin, that order had to be broken to such an extent that all efficaciously supernatural providence after the sin had to proceed from the predestination of Christ as from the primary meritorious principle of all grace." 129

Lastly, this question prescinds from the theological controversy as to whether predestination is effected before or after the foreseen merits of man, for it is not repugnant that it should be effected before the foreseen merits of man and after the foreseen merits of Christ and Mary.127

Opinions. All theologians who deny that the merits of Christ exerted any causality on predestination must necessarily deny it of Mary's merits. Thus, although Scotus affirms that Christ was the first of the predestined before any prevision of original sin, he maintains that Christ's merits were directed to man after that sin and that they were therefore the cause of the effects of predestination but not of predestination itself.128

Sudrez distinguishes between election and predestination and teaches that the merits of Christ are the cause of the latter but not of the former. According to Suarez, predestination implies an efficacious and absolute love of God, whereas election implies an efficacious but relative love, which allows for that consideration by which some men are elected and others are not.128 Therefore, God could have made the election in Christ but He could not elect some and not others on the basis of the merits of Christ.

Lorca vigorously opposes the opinion of Suârez. According to him, neither the election nor the love of the predestined can be attributed to Christ's merits, since both are prior to the executive decree of His coming and, by the same token, are anterior to the prevision of His merits, since God, because He willed to save us, willed Christ to be

the Redeemer of the world. Hence, according to Lorca, the merits of Christ were the cause of our predestination in the order of execution but not in the order of intention.[180]

The more probable opinion seems to be that the predestination of the saints is due to the merits of Christ and the Blessed Virgin.

The entire economy of redemption in the present providence rests on the merits of Christ and Mary, because God decreed to save the world through them. If, then, the predestination of the saints belongs to the economy of redemption, in the present order of providence it seems logical to attribute it to those merits.

Moreover, predestination is none other than an act of the salvific will of God. But this will cannot be conceived independently of the merits of Christ and Mary, because God did not wish to restore the fallen human race in any other way than by the satisfaction and merits of Christ and by the co-satisfaction and merits of Mary, associated as His consort in the work of human redemption.'[81]

5) *In addition to the internal grace by which man is justified and saved, Mary merited external graces for us,* which are the causes, instruments or dispositions for justification and salvation. To these exterior graces pertain the law of God, revelation, the preaching of the faith, the institution and magisterium of the Church, the sacraments and the rest, in all of which Mary concurred, not only meritoriously, but also in other ways, as we shall explain in the proper place.'[32]

t h e s i s: *The excellence of Mary's merits considered absolutely.*

Although the Virgin Mother of God merited by all the actions of her life, so that, as Garau says,[133] life did not precede merit in her, nevertheless her meritorious works must be considered principally from the moment of the Incarnation. United to the redemptive intention of Christ, they had to be crowned by her maternal compassion at the Cross, in the same way that Christ's works had to be completed by His passion and death.

St. Bernard thus praises the excellence of Mary's merit in giving her consent to the Incarnation: "Behold, the price of salvation is offered you; we shall be instantly delivered if you consent. . . . We were all created by the power of the eternal word of God, and yet we are dead. In your brief reply we shall be newly created and re-

turned to life.''[184] And such was the excellence of this merit that St. Bernardine of Siena does not hesitate to say that by her consent to the Incarnation, Mary merited more than all other creatures by all their acts and thoughts.'[38]

Here we shall consider especially the merit of Mary's compassion at the cross of her Son.

The grandeur and quantity of merit flow from three main sources: the magnitude of charity, promptness of will and the difficulty of the work. Since the weight of charity always gives the value to meritorious works, there is no doubt that the magnitude of charity increases merit to an extraordinary degree. For that reason, St. Albert the Great says that the root of merit is in charity, not because it alone is meritorious, but because it is more so than any other, since merit must be measured by the quantity of love.'[38]

Now the magnitude of Mary's charity in her maternal compassion is immeasurable, if one considers her love for God, Christ and the whole human race, because from the moment that she conceived her Son she was inflamed with vehement zeal for the salvation of men. This charity reached its peak in her compassion, as St. Albert infers when he states that every suffering of Mary was meritorious and she brought her charity to its highest point during the passion of her Son.'[3']

As regards Mary's promptness of will, it can be summarized by saying that she offered her Son for us spontaneously and joyfully.[138] Although the passion and death of her Son were contrary to her maternal inclination and were the cause of most bitter grief, she realized at the same time that Christ's passion and death were the only means of redemption for man, and for that reason she desired them most ardently.

In regard to the difficulty of the work, which increases merit, to present her only Son at the altar of sacrifice and to witness His terrible death was a task of immense difficulty and was humanly impossible. As Salazar says, a greater hardship cannot be imagined.[13·]

Theologians dispute whether merit is the more excellent as sanctifying grace is greater or the dignity of the person who merits. In regard to *condign* merit, there are strong arguments for both sides, although it seems more probable that the quantitative difference of grace does not increase or diminish merit. John of St. Thomas states

that grace performs two functions: it gives dignity to the person (and consequently to his acts) and it influences the acts as *principium quo*. Now if the greater grace exerts a greater influence on acts, the merit of those acts must be diverse. But if the influence of grace is equal in various acts, the greater dignity of the person does not make the act more meritorious, for although more intense grace makes a person more pleasing to God, as regards merit, grace is always the same and varies only accidentally so far as the grace is greater, since the dignity of the one who merits consists in the fact that the individual participates in the nature of God and is adopted as His son. Personally considered, this dignity always has the same moral value, even if grace continues to increase accidentally and physically, because the same adoption as sons and the same basic participation in the nature of God are given to all. Therefore, if the acts are equal in their specific perfection, they will not have greater value in the moral order because of the dignity of the person, as they would if they proceeded from a divine Person, which does not admit of any adoptive filiation but is natural to the divine Person.[140]

The same may be said concerning the accidental dignities which adorn the created person, and which, in reality, never increase the merit of an act on the part of the one who performs it. But Christ's condition is unique in this respect, by reason of the substantial dig nity of tire divine Person, which gives an infinite value to His human acts.

Actually, there is a great difference between the dignity of a person through grace and the dignity of the divine Person. By the former a man is made a partaker of God's nature and an adoptive son of God; his acts are supernatural in themselves, as the Angelic Doctor says: "The worth of the work depends on the dignity of grace, whereby a man, being made a partaker of the divine nature, is adopted as a son of God." [141] Hence it is that, although grace increases, dignity as regards merit is the same in all, because the dignity of the one meriting consists in the fact that he has been made a partaker in the divine nature and an adopted son of God, an adop tion which is the same in all the just by reason of their participation in the divine nature.

On the other hand, the dignity of the divine Person is the dignity of the natural Son of God which gives Christ's human actions.

though finite in their entity and intrinsic morality, an infinite value, derived from the infinite dignity of the Person performing them.

But if it is a matter of *congruous* merit, it is clear that one must consider the greater holiness and dignity of the person, because greater holiness makes the meritorious work more praiseworthy and greater friendship more readily obtains what is sought. On the other hand, the more worthy the person making the offering, the more highly esteemed arc his gifts and presents.

It follows from this that the merits of Mary were of the greatest value, not only because of the plenitude of graces which adorn her, elevating her above all the saints, but also because of her dignity as the Mother of God and associate of Christ in human redemption, which makes her greatly superior to all creatures. It cannot be denied that the dignity of the Mother of God, the loftiest outside the hypostatic union, carrying with it the most intimate and excellent union with God, necessarily increased the value of her merit to an extraordinary degree. And this dignity affects Mary's merits from the first moment of her immaculate conception, since the value of her works was not completely restricted to the office of her maternity. The divine choice of the Virgin for this office was sufficient, because, by the simple fact of her being chosen as the Mother of God, she surpasses almost infinitely in dignity the highest and most excellent of creatures.

t h e s i s: *The excellence of Mary's merit in comparison to the merits of Christ and the saints.*

Christ's merit as Redeemer surpasses infinitely that of the Blessed Virgin in perfection, universality and efficacy.

a) *In perfection,* because by the sole fact of proceeding from a divine Person, it is morally infinite, condign with that condignity which attains to the strictest justice and is absolutely independent of any other previous merit. On the other hand, Mary's merits, although dignified by her divine maternity, by her association in redemption and by her fullness of grace, proceed from a pure creature and are therefore finite, congruous and subordinate to Christ's merit.

b) In *universality,* because Christ's merits extend to all the graces and charisms which were to be conferred upon all men of all times, not excluding His own Mother; but her merits do not enjoy this uni-

venality, because Christ merited for Himself and for Mary some of the things that Mary' could not merit.

c) *In efficacy,* because Christ's merit is the primary principle and Mary's merits receive their force and efficacy from His.

However, the merits of the Blessed Virgin greatly surpass those of all the saints in perfection, universality and efficacy.

a) In *perfection,* because Marian merit reaches a more excellent degree than could be imagined in any creature, by reason of her dignity as the Mother of God, her association with the Redeemer, her immense charity, and the ardent zeal by which she procured the salvation of mankind.

b) In *universality,* for while the rest of the just can merit only certain graces and for certain men, Mary's merit extends to all graces and to all men, as is demanded by her office as co-redcmptrix.

c) In *efficacy,* because the merits of the just for others pertain only to *subjective* redemption, where the graces merited by Christ and by Mary arc applied to each soul, but Mary's merits not only pertain to subjective redemption, but also to *objective* redemption, insofar as she suffered and "died" with Christ and thereby merited with Him for all men.

SACRIFICIAL ASPECT OF MARY'S COOPERATION

Previous Observation. Sacrifice, which etymologically means something made sacred *(sacrum factum),* can be taken in a strict and proper sense or in a broad and improper sense. In the first sense it is a special act of the virtue of religion, which deserves special praise because it is performed exclusively out of the reverence which is due to God alone. It is usually defined as the oblation of a sensible thing, with some change in that thing, made to God in a lawful manner in recognition of His supreme majesty and our subjection to Him. In the second sense it may consist in the elicited acts of some other virtues which bear some resemblance to the notion of true sacrifice, such as the acts of humility, patience, temperance, self-abnegation. Thus, we read in Ps. 50:19: "My sacrifice, O God, is a contrite spirit"; and in St. Augustine: "A true sacrifice is every good work which is performed in order to unite us to God in that holy society, referring

it to the end of that good by which wc can become blessed." [4*]

Sacrifice in the strict sense may be considered metaphysically and physically. Considered metaphysically, it pertains to the genus of a sacred sign, because the sacrificial act, taken materially as the immolation of animals, the pouring of wine or oil, the burning of incense, etc., possesses nothing in itself which pertains to the honor of God. A special relation to divine worship is necessary, a relation which can be acquired only by the meaning which is given to the sacrificial act. For that reason St. Augustine says that a visible sacrifice is a sacrament—that is, a sacred sign—of an invisible sacrifice.[4*]

But the meaning attached to a sacrifice is twofold: theological and moral. The first consists in the objective expression of the infinite excellence of God as the first cause of all things, absolute Lord, supreme good, and last end, to whom we must refer all things. The second, naturally united to the first, consists in the objective testimony of the interior affections of soul by which man, in his submission as a servant, consecrates himself entirely to God. Thus, St. Thomas says that the external sacrifice represents the interior and true sacrifice so far as the human mind offers itself to God as the principle of its existence, the author of its operation and the end wherein lies its happiness.[144] This meaning is essential to sacrifice considered in itself and in any condition of human nature, but in the state of fallen nature the practical recognition of the divine excellence, together with our obligatory submission, must always be made by means of penance, reparation and satisfaction, in order to appease God offended by men. Hence, the primary motive of sacrifice is *latreutic,* because sacrifice is primarily an explicit profession of the infinite majesty of God and of our total submission to Him. To that primary motive are intimately united the *eucharistie* and *impetratory* aspects, for it is impossible to praise the excellence and goodness of God without at the same time thinking of that goodness in reference to ourselves and considering the benefits we have received or hope to receive. Thus, we show our gratitude for benefits we have received and wc ask for those we shall need in the future in the various circumstances of life. But because of the fact of sin, we cannot omit the *propitiatory* aspect, which consists in the penitential and satisfactory acts we offer an offended God.

Considered physically, sacrifice is the subject of the meaning which

is proper to it, and two dements constitute the physical sacrifice: the thing sacrificed and the action by which it is sacrificed. The thing sacrificed must be something sensible and substantial, because sacrifice pertains to external worship, for which mere human acts, such as singing the psalms, kneeling down, prostrating and similar actions, do not suffice, but other things are necessary which, by virtue of man's actions, give praise to the divine majesty. Generally speaking, all those things are suitable over which man has dominion and by whose oblation he can manifest his complete submission to the absolute sovereignty of God. However, in the sacrifices which were instituted by God, nothing was ever offered but those things necessary for the sustenance of human life, such as animals, bread, wine, or things which represented them symbolically, such as incense.

The act by which the sacrifice is effected is twofold: oblation and immolation or a change in the thing offered. Oblation is the act by which the sensible thing is offered to God as a gift, a tribute or a debt to be paid. This oblation must be voluntary, otherwise it would not be an offering, and it must be external and sensible because the purpose of sacrifice is to give God external and public honor. Immolation is the act by which a visible gift is changed, destroyed or killed. For the Gentiles, immolation was a rite prior to the death of the victim. According to general acceptation, immolation is the destruction or death of the victim, but it does not have the same meaning in all authors, since sometimes they use this word to signify the entire sacrifice; at other times they apply it to the priestly oblation; and yet again they speak of oblation and immolation as two distinct acts which are mutually related.

That oblation pertains to the essence of sacrifice is shown in Sacred Scripture, where it is frequently mentioned that sacrifices were offered to God. In Genesis, for example, we read that Abel offered the firstborn of his flock (4:4), and that Noe, leaving the ark, offered holocausts upon the altar (8:2). In the Epistle to the Hebrews (5:1), the Apostle says, speaking in general: "For every highpriest taken from among men is appointed for men in the things pertaining to God, that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." Likewise the immolation, destruction or change of a sensible thing is common to all sacrifice, as is stated in many places in Sacred Scripture. Thus, the destruction of Christ's corporal life took place

in the sacrifice of the Cross. In the bloody sacrifices of the Old Law, animals were killed either in expiation, of which St. Paul speaks: "And with blood almost everything is cleansed according to the Law, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness" (Heb. 9:22), or they were burned as holocausts as "the sweet odor of God" (Lev. 9:1), and even in the peace offerings the blood of the victims was poured around the altar. It was quite different in the unbloody sacrifices, in which part of the animal was burned at the altar (Lev. 2:2) and the rest was saved for consumption. But in the sacrifice of liquids, the blood, wine or oil were poured around the altar (Lev. 1, 2; Exod. 29:40). The destruction of the victim offered in honor of God was of itself an acknowledgement of man's subjection and surrender to his Creator.

Whether these two actions, oblation and immolation, are essential and constitutive parts of sacrifice or one constitutive and the other merely a necessary condition, is disputed among theologians. And even among those who hold that the two acts pertain to the essence of sacrifice as proximate matter and physical form, it is debated which of them constitutes the physical form of the sacrifice. There is also a dispute regarding the order to be observed in regard to the two actions, that is, whether immolation should precede, follow or accompany the oblation. We shall discuss these controversies in their proper place.

It should also be noted that sacrifice cannot be offered indiscriminately by anyone, but only by a lawfully deputed priest. In both the Mosaic law and the law of grace, only priests are permitted to offer sacrifice, as was taught by St. Paul in Hebrews **J**:1-4 an^ was firmed by the Council of Trent.*[48]

It is necessary to maintain here that Christ is a priest, and in such an eminent way that not only is He the Highpriest, but He is the source of all the priesthood in the New Law. Thus is He called "a highpriest over the house of God" (Heb. 10:21); "a priest forever" (Heb. 5:6); "a great highpriest who has passed into the heavens" (Heb. 4:14); "highpriest of the good things to come" (Heb. 9:11). Christ is a priest with regard to His human nature, which subsists in the Person of the Word, and therefore Christ, as the Word, is the *principium quod,* and His human nature is the *principium quo* of His priestly actions.[140] This is reasonable, because it is proper to a

priest, as such, to be inferior to God, because he is the intermediary between God and men. Therefore, if we would say that Christ is a priest by reason of His divine nature, we would have to make Him inferior to the Father in His divine nature, an affirmation which would be completely Arian; or we would have to hold for the complete absorption of His divine nature in His human nature, which would be pure Monophysite doctrine.

It must be assumed that Christ was constituted a priest in the Incarnation and by it, and not by any choice or visible and external consecration. The Apostle presents Him as willing, from the beginning of the Incarnation, to offer the sacrifice required and desired by God: "Therefore, in coming into the world, he says, sacrifice and oblation Thou wouldst not, but a body thou hast fitted to Me: in holocausts and sin-offerings Thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Behold, I come (in the head of the book it is written of Me) to do Thy will, O God" (Hcb. 10:5-7).

Truly, Christ could not have been a priest before the Incarnation because His human nature did not yet exist. He was a priest from the time of the Incarnation, since on receiving human nature, He also received the obligation of offering Himself as a victim for the reconciliation of the human race, for which He was destined by God. Now, whoever is destined by God to the oblation of a victim is by that very fact constituted a priest. For that reason, St. Athanasius says that the Word became a priest by assuming human nature.

We must also suppose that in exercising His office as priest, Christ offered a true sacrifice on the Cross, offering Himself voluntarily to God as a victim for the redemption of the world. Therefore, Christ as man is both the priest who offers and the victim offered. St. Paul says: "Walk in love, as Christ also loved us and delivered Himself up for us an offering and a sacrifice to God to ascend in fragrant odor" (Eph. 5:2). Undoubtedly, then, in the death which Christ suffered on the Cross are found the elements of a true sacrifice: the *sacrificing priest* (Christ, the God-Man, constituted a priest at the Incarnation, according to His human nature), the *victim sacrificed* (the Person of Christ, formally as Man), and the *sacrificial act* (the destruction of the human life of Christ, externally manifested and offered to God with a sacrificial intention). Keeping in mind the

foregoing doctrine, we now come to the study of Mary's cooperation in the work of redemption with regard to its sacrificial aspect.

thesis: *Mary's oblation of Christ in the sacrifice of the Cross did not constitute a sacrifice in the strict and proper sense, but only in a broad sense.*

It is certain that Mary offered to God a sacrifice in the broad sense. From the first instant of her immaculate conception she offered her entire being and all her most perfect acts of virtue to God.,IT Also, in offering herself together with Christ, she suffered the maternal compassion, which was also a true sacrifice, but in a wide sense. We shall now investigate the part which Mary played in the sacrifice of Christ.

It is clear that Mary cooperated in a remote manner in Christ's sacrifice because in all sacrifice properly speaking there must be a priest and a victim, and in the sacrifice on the Cross, Christ was both, with regard to His human nature.

By her free consent, Mary cooperated in the priestly consecration of Christ, because this priestly consecration of Christ was not made without her giving her consent, as is seen in the words of St. Luke (1:38): "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to thy word." She, therefore, gave the subject of consecration conceived by herself and she provided her virginal womb as the sanctuary, consecrated especially for this purpose.118

It is also certain that the Blessed Virgin participated actively in the sacrifice of redemption, since she prepared the victim. Thus, St. Pius X stated that we praise the Blessed Virgin not only because she provided from her own flesh the matter from which the Only-begotten of God would become man, but also because she protected and nourished Him and thus led the victim to the altar at the proper time.110

But now we ask whether Mary, as the companion of Christ the Redeemer, participated in any way in the sacrifice of the Cross which accomplished the redemption of the human race. There are two principal actions in a sacrifice: immolation of the victim and oblation. In no way did Mary cooperate effectively in the immolation, considering this immolation materially or formally.

The material death of the victim is not a sacrificial action; it need not be executed by the priest, and in the Mosaic ritual it was often performed by a layman. In the sacrifice of the Cross it was executed by the Jews and they did not effect a sacrifice but were instruments in a malicious act, the greatest of sacrilcgcs.[18n] Formal immolation is the ordination of the victim to sacrificial death, and when this death is identified with the oblation, as occurs in some sacrifices, the immolation coincides with the oblation. Therefore, the question is reduced ultimately to the act of oblation, and thus it may be asked again whether Man', by her oblation, cooperated in the sacrifice of the Cross in a proximate and active manner.

Opinions. Besides the theologians who were opposed to the doctrine of Mary's immediate cooperation in objective redemption in general, we mention F. Tummers, who admits Mary's proximate cooperation by way of satisfaction and merit, but maintains that her cooperation by way of sacrifice was merely remote and was cooperation in an improper sense.[181] This opinion differs little from the one we are defending.

On the other hand, Borzi[182] greatly exaggerates Mary's participation in the priesthood of the Cross. According to him, Mary, together with Christ, offered the Father a sacrifice, strictly as such, for the salvation of mankind. Fricthoff affirms that the action of Mary in the sacrifice is certainly different from that nf Christ, but maintains that the oblation of the victim need not be pluralized, because although they are different actions, there is only one action which proceeds from a primary cause and passes to a secondary cause.[183]

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Leo XIII says that Mary stood by the cross of Jesus out of her immense love for us and she voluntarily offered her Son to the justice of God in order to receive us as her children.[18*]

St. Pius X says: "When the supreme hour of the Son came, beside the cross of Jesus there stood Mary, His Mother, not merely occupied in contemplating the cruel spectacle, but rejoicing that her only Son was offered for the salvation of mankind." [18s]

Pope Benedict XV explains that by uniting herself to her Son's passion and death, and surrendering her maternal rights for the salvation of the world, and, as far as it depended on her, immolating

her Son to appease divine justice, it can be said that she redeemed the human race with Christ.[18·]

Theologians and Doctors of the Church. Arnold of Chartres writes: "Doubtless there was one will between Christ and Mary, and both at the same time offered to God one sacrifice, the one in the blood of her heart, the other in the blood of His body." [,8T] St. Bonaventure exclaims: "She has given her only Son, whom she loved more than herself, for us." [188] St. Albert the Great says that by her spontaneous consent to the Passion she offered her Son for all of us.[18·]

Theological Argument. Mary is Christ's consort in the work of redemption; therefore, she participates in redemption by way of sacrifice. Now, Mary's participation in the sacrifice of Calvary was at least proximate, and it seems to consist in an act of oblation by which she offered Christ when He offered Himself on the altar of the Cross.

Nevertheless, Mary's oblation was not sacrificial in the strict and proper sense. Arnold of Chartres says that there were two altars of sacrifice; one, the soul of Mary, the other, the body of Christ. Christ sacrificed his flesh, Mary, her soul, though she wished to add her blood to His and to consummate with her Son the sacrifice of our redemption by the death of her body. But it was the exclusive privilege of the Highpricst to offer His blood and this could be shared with no one else. Therefore, in the reparation of mankind no angel or human being could share this power with Him.[180]

Sacrificial oblation is strictly a priestly act, and therefore Mary could not perform it, because she was neither called to nor invested with the priestly character. Moreover, oblation is the act by which a victim is offered or consecrated to God, and Christ alone could give Himself to God in sacrifice, because He alone had dominion over His own life. Other men have no power over their own lives nor the lives of others, and therefore they cannot offer them in sacrifice unless God gives them a special command to do so, as He did to Abraham (Gen. 22:12). For that reason, the passion and death *of* the martyrs cannot be called a sacrifice except in an improper sense, because they could not die when they wished nor could they prevent their death at will.[1*1] It follows that Mary had no dominion over the life of Christ. She certainly had maternal rights, rights which she

surrendered. He was truly her Son, but she had no right to sacrifice her Son's body and life.

Nevertheless, Mary consented generously to her Son's immolation for the salvation of the world, and she had already consented when she freely accepted her maternity, knowing that Iie was to be a Man of sorrows. The consent which she expressed to the angel was ratified at the foot of the Cross.

Of this will of Mary, united perfectly to that of the Father, who sent His Son to die, and to that of the Savior, who was immolated for the salvation of mankind, St. Antoninus dares to say that if necessary, Mary herself would have placed her Son on the Cross for the salvation of the world.[102] Gerson says the same.[103] However, it is a pious exaggeration to say, as Godts does, that Mary at Calvary offered an identical sacrifice with her Son as the newly-ordained priest offers the same sacrifice with the bishop in the Mass of ordination.[104] Mary does not participate in the priesthood.

Nevertheless, as Mother and consort of the Highpriest, though not as priest, Mary was intimately associated with the sacrifice of the Cross, and she cooperated in it by an affective oblation [105] of the objective sacrifice of Christ, from which results her subjective co-sacrifice.[100]

The victim offered to God by the Son and the Mother was the same; Mary alone, among all creatures, could offer to the Father, as hers, that immaculate Victim. The will of the Son and the Mother was one; the spirit of adoring God and being a propitiation for mankind was one. In a word, the flame of love was the same in both. And so, Mary was united to Christ in the sacrifice of the Cross, not by an identity of the act of oblation, but by an intimate union of love.

t h e s i s: *Whether Mary can be called a priest.*

By reason of her cooperation in the consecration of the Highpriest of the New Law and the preparation of the Victim of the Cross, and by reason of her union with Christ in the bloody sacrifice and her part in the Sacrifice of the Mass (which we shall treat later), Mary has received many titles related to the priesthood and sacrifice. She has been called Mother of the divine priesthood, minister of the divine priesthood, companion of the divine sacrifice, sacerdotal Virgin, priestess and priest. St. Epiphanius calls her priest and altar at the same time, who gave us Christ, the bread of heaven, for the remission of sin."[107] St. John Damascene calls her Virgin-priest;[108] St. Antoninus, following St. Albert the Great, calls her the priestess *of* justice.'[08] The title is also used by Lepicier, Grimai, Hugon, Godts and especially by De la Taille, who calls Mary a priestess since she participates in the oblation of the Eucharist which the Church celebrates in accordance with the command of our Lord: "Do this in commemoration of Me."

In order to avoid all confusion in attributing this title to Mary, it is necessary to distinguish a triple priesthood: substantial, sacramental (juridical) and spiritual (mystical). The first two are strictly sacerdotal; the third is improper and analogical.

In no way can we attribute to Mary the substantial priesthood. This is the priesthood of Christ exclusively, who by the singular election of God was deputed as a priest in the hypostatic union. Nor does the sacramental and juridical priesthood pertain to Mary, because she was not chosen by the Lord as a minister, but as a consort and helper.[170] Neither did she receive the sacrament of holy orders nor the priestly character.[171]

Rather, the spiritual and mystical priesthood fully becomes her, as it does the rest of the faithful, whom St. John calls "priests to God His Father" (Apoc. i:6) and St. Peter calls "a holy priesthood" (I Pet. 2:5-9), to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. In this sense, Mary, chosen as the helper of Christ, the supreme Highpriest, participated in the spiritual and mystical priesthood in a more eminent way than did the rest of men.[172] Therefore, Mary is the companion and cooperator of Christ in the work of redemption but she is not His representative, and therefore she cannot be called a priest in the strict or proper sense, any more than the rest of the faithful who have not received the sacrament of holy orders. The title is applied to Mary, as to the rest of the faithful, only in an analogical and improper sense. Here we must apply the rule of St. Thomas, who states that such expressions should not be extended nor used in a proper sense, but should be explained in accordance with piety wherever they appear in the writings of the Fathers.[178]

On January 13, 1875, the Holy Office admonished theologians

who, under the name of piety, introduce names or titles that smack of novelty or arc not sanctioned by custom. On January 15, 1913, the Holy Office forbade the use of statues in which the Blessed Virgin is dressed in priestly vestments. On April 8, 1916, the same Holy Office forbade the propagation of the devotion to Mary under the title of priest or as sacerdotal Virgin.

Actually, the title Virgin-priest is a novelty and is not substantiated by custom. In Christian tradition it is found only twice: in the fifth homily, *De laudibus B.M. Virginis,* preserved among the apocryphal writings of St. Epiphanius, and in the writings of St. John Damascene. But the words of this holy Doctor do not seem to refer to the priesthood as such, for he praises Mary's purity in relation to the purity proper to the priesthood. In modem times there are very few who give Mary that title, and these arc usually writers in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Grimai states that the expression Virgin-priest cannot be found in the Fathers or ancient theologians.[174]

REDEMPTIVE ASPECT OF MARY'S COOPERATION

Thesis: By *her compassion Mary cooperated formally and strictly in human redemption.*

Previous Observations. Redemption means to buy back. According to the original meaning, the purchase referred only to things, and was merely the exchange of a price for an object belonging to another. But the purchase is called redemption strictly if the payment of the price returns the object to the person who had previously possessed it. In a similar manner, it is called redemption when it concerns persons, such as slaves or captives, when the payment of a price restores them to freedom or to their former master. In this question we treat of the redemption of persons in the supernatural order, or the liberation of men from their condition as slaves and their restoration to the state of freedom as sons of God, thus restoring them to the dominion of the Master to whom they belong, not only by right of creation, but by right of grace.

In order that there be true redemption, there must be a captive and a detainer of the captive, a redeemer and a price of redemption.

Now, the captive or slave is the entire human race, fallen into the miserable slavery of sin and destined as a result to death and eternal punishment. God and the devil are, as it were, two contenders for the possession of mankind.

Tire Redeemer is Christ, "who gave Himself for us that He might redeem ns from all iniquity" (I Tit. 2:14). "He has rescued us from the power of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of His beloved Son" (Col. 1:13-14).

The price of redemption is not a perishable thing, such as silver or gold, but "the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (I Pet. 1:19). This price was not to be paid to the devil, as was taught by Origen, St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nyssa. The price had to be paid to the one who held the captive by right of dominion, to the creditor, to the person offended, to the supreme judge, who is God alone, because to Him alone belongs the power of condemning to hell (Luke 12:5). It was not to be paid to the devil, who held the captive as does the guard of the prison, the minister and executor of the orders of the judge.[17]

We shall now consider the manner in which Mary cooperated in redemption by her maternal compassion.

Fathers and Doctors of the Church. St. Ephrem calls Mary our liberation from captivity, the help of sinners and the price of our redemption.[176] Chrysippus speaks of the devil's victory over the first woman and his definitive defeat by the second woman, Mary.[177] George of Nicomedia states that through Mary the human race returns to its fatherland.[178] In another place he speaks of Mary as a beautiful oblation, the price of our redemption.[17]' St. John Damascene and St. Bonaventure refer to Mary as having purchased our freedom.[180]

Theological Argument. Mary's compassion certainly cooperated in our salvation by way of satisfaction or co-satisfaction. This satisfaction always has the aspect of a redemptive price, for St. Thomas says that the satisfaction by which one satisfies for oneself or another is called the price which redeems from sin and its penalty, according to Dan. 4:24: "Redeem thou thy sins with alms."[181] Therefore Mary's compassion did have the aspect of a redemptive price.

To redeem the human race is to free it from the bondage of sin and its corresponding penalties by paying the price due. Mary coop-

eratcd in this in two ways: by offering her own suffering, which was, in a certain way, a price paid for our redemption, and, together with Christ but in her own manner, by paying the same price that He paid.

Pope Pius VII stated that the Christian faithful arc certainly obliged to venerate the memory of the most bitter pains which Mary suffered at the foot of the Cross with singular fortitude and unflinching constancy for the salvation of mankind.[182]

St. Albert the Great praises the charity of the Blessed Virgin by stating that although she did not give her life for her neighbor, she gave the life of her Son and her Son Himself, whom she loved much more than her own life, and if it had been necessary she would have offered her own life and would have been crucified with her Son.[1"]

Gerson invites the Christian faithful to meditate how the Mother participated in the death of her Son for the redemption of the human race. As a good mother, she would have been willing to pay the price of redemption for her children if the offering of her Son had not been sufficient, though His death was sufficient to redeem a thousand worlds.[184]

Tire passion and death of Christ, offered for human salvation, is a condign and adequate price for our redemption. Tire Blessed Virgin, at the foot of the Cross, offered Christ for the salvation of the world, thus uniting her will to that of her Son and to that of the Father who sent the Son for the salvation of men. St. Bonaventure says that she desired to offer her Son for the world's salvation so that as Mother she could be in perfect conformity with the will of the Father.[185] Arnold of Chartres states that there was but one will between Christ and Mary' and that the two offered one and the same holocaust—Mary, the blood of the spirit, and Christ, the blood of His body.[186]

St. Albert the Great speaks in a similar manner when he says that Mary considered the death of her Son as the price of our redemption and she willingly offered the life of Christ as the price of redemption.[187] Accordingly, Pope Leo XIII says that Mary' was permeated with such an immense charity that she joyfully offered her Son to divine justice, dying with Him as her heart was pierced with the sword of sorrow.[188]

Nor is it a valid objection to say that the redemptive price should

be proper to the one redeeming and not to any other, and that the blood of Christ, the real price of human redemption, was not Mary's but Christ's. In the first place, Christ's blood, the price of redemption, was in a certain way Mary's also, because, according to Pope Benedict XV, she had maternal rights over her Son, but surrendered them for the salvation of mankind. In the second place, since the blood was more properly Christ's than Mary's, it is evident that Christ is Redeemer primarily and perfectly, and Mary is co-redemptrix in a secondary manner, with Christ and dependent upon Him.

CHAPTER THREE

Gary's Cooperation in Subjective Redemption

*

Having studied Mary's cooperation in objective redemption, by which the fruits of redemption were acquired and accumulated, thus constituting the infinite treasury of graces, we pass on to an investigation of her cooperation in subjective redemption, which has as its object the distribution and application of the fruits of objective redemption to all men. Objective redemption is like a prepared medicine. It has the power to cure, but it will not do so unless it is given to the sick. St. Prosperus, referring to the Incarnation, says that "this potion is profitable for all, but if one does not drink it, it does not benefit one."1

Mary's cooperation in subjective redemption signifies her personal intervention in the application of the fruits and the distribution of the graces of redemption. This cooperation may be mediate and radical or immediate and formal. We are not discussing the first type, because it is evident that all the graces of redemption come to us through Mary mediately and radically because she gave us the Savior, who is the fountain and source of all good. St. Albert the Great says that she gave us her Son, and with Him all things.2 The reason is obvious: whatever is the cause and origin of the cause is likewise the cause of the effect. Therefore Pctau concludes that just as Christ is for us the source of all good, so His Mother can be considered in a certain way and rightly the root and principle of all good."

We treat, therefore, of the formal, immediate and actual cooperation of Mary in the distribution of redemptive graces. We shall investigate the fact or truth of that cooperation, the manner of its execution and the type of causality involved, and Mary's intervention in the concession of certain special graces of singular importance.

Mary's Cooperation in the Distribution of Graces

Jesus Christ is our only Mediator, as proved by the words of St. Pius X: "It cannot, of course, be denied that the dispensing of these treasures is the particular and supreme right of Jesus Christ, for they are the exclusive fmit of His death, who by His nature is the Mediator between God and man."3 4 He is the Head of the mystical body, from which life flows to all the members. He alone, by the power of excellence, distributes graces to all mankind, as St. John says: "I am the vine, you are the branches" (15:5); and "Of His fullness we have all received, grace for grace" (1:16). Christ exercises this office constantly, interceding for us and distributing all the graces of redemption. "He lives always to make intercession for them" (Hcb. 8:25).

t h e s i s: *Mary cooperates proximately and actually in the distribution of all graces.*

Previous Observations. It is hardly necessary to remark that it is not a matter of Mary's cooperation in the distribution of graces in the sense that such a prerogative belongs to her *ex ipsa natura rei,* in such a way that God, absolutely speaking, could not bestow any grace without Mary's mediation, but insofar as it pertains to her *ex positivo et libero Dei decreto* (by a positive and free decree of God), who in the present economy has determined and willed not to bestow any redemptive grace without the mediation of the Blessed Virgin. Once this disposition of the divine will is admitted, Mary's cooperation in the distribution of graces is hypothetically necessary. Therefore, by reason of a "consequent impotence," God could not bestow any grace without Mary's intervention because He cannot contradict His own decree.® Merkelbach states that although he would not dare to affirm that grace cannot be bestowed in any other way, there is no indication of this.® This cooperation of Mary in the distribution of graces must be understood as applying numerically to all the redemptive graces bestowed on mankind since original sin. although her intervention in graces granted under the Old Law must be understood in a different manner. The universality of her mediation extends to all graces, internal and external, habitual and actual,

gratum facientes and *gratis datae,* sacramental and extra sacramental, ordinal}' and extraordinary, petitioned and non-pctitioncd, those impetrated by the Virgin Mary and those impetrated by Christ or the saints. In a word, all graces bestowed in the present economy. Excluded from this mediation are the gifts of grace bestowed on Christ and Mar)'. As to the graces bestowed on the angels and our first parents before original sin, we shall speak later. Finally, in this question we are not studying the power given Mary, by which she can, through her most powerful intercession, obtain everything relative to salvation, but her actual cooperation or her particular intervention since her assumption into heaven, to obtain grace for individuals. We are not speaking here of her life on earth.

Errors. Mary's intervention in the dispensing of graces is denied by Luther, Calvin, Brcncius, Bullinger and all their followers, who consider excessive any praise in relation to this prerogative of Mary, as if Christ's glory as Mediator would thereby be diminished.7 The Jansenists also oppose this distribution of graces, although not openly, but surreptitiously, under the pretext of defending traditional Mariological doctrine. The errors of all were gathered into a booklet edited in 1675 by Adam Widenfeldt under the title: Monita salutaria Beatae Mariae *Virginis ad cultores suos indiscretos.* Using ambiguous and calumnious words, the author speaks cunningly and craftily against the cult, devotion and glorious titles of Mary which pertain to her office as dispenser of graces.

Among the Catholic theologians opposed to the doctrine of Mary's universal distribution of graces was Theophilus Raynaud, an otherwise great panegyrist of Marian privileges. He considered it an excess of piety and explained any such statements of the Fathers as applying to mediate causality, that is, by reason of Christ, to whom she gave existence.8

Muratori, a pious man devoted to the Blessed Virgin, also opposed this doctrine in his book, *Della regolata divozione dei Christiani,* written under the pseudonym of Lamindo Pritanio. He remarked that to pretend that all the graces we receive from God come to us through Mary, would be a devout exaggeration. Muratori was refuted by Father Benedict Piazza, S.J., who examined and analyzed every one of his affirmations and pointed out their ambiguities.® Also involved in this controversy was Trombclli, who inclined toward Muratori's opinion.10

In our days, the affirmative opinion of the distribution of all graces by Mary does not please some writers, among whom are Fischer and Ude, who believe that the adduced arguments are weak and insufficient in proving Mary's actual mediation.11

On the other hand, most Catholic theologians, particulary since the nineteenth century, defend Mary's actual and universal mediation in the dispensation of all graces. This doctrine is not a dogma of faith nor is it uniformly classified by theologians. However, taking into account the ordinary magisterium of the Church, Catholic tradition (less clear in antiquity and more express in later times), the consensus of modern theologians, and the feeling and common piety of the Christian people, we may affirm that Mary's universal mediation in the distribution of graces is at least *proxima fidei.*

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Benedict XIV refers to Mary as the celestial river by which all gifts and graces reach men.'2 Pope Pius VII calls her the dispenser of all graces.'' Pope Pius IX states that "God has committed to Mary the treasury of all good things, in order that everyone may know that through her are obtained every hope, every grace, and all salvation. For this is His will, that we obtain everything through Mary." 14

Pope Leo XIII calls Mary the "guardian of our peace and the minister to us of heavenly grace" 15 and in speaking specifically about Mary's mediation, he says: "With equal truth may it be also affirmed that, by the will of God, Mary is the intermediary through whom is distributed unto us this immense treasure of God's mercies; 'for grace and truth come by Jesus Christ.' Thus, as no man goes to the Father but by the Son, so no one goes to Christ except through His Mother." 18

The Pope teaches this doctrine again in speaking of the efficacy of the Rosary: "First, as is fitting and right, comes the Lord's Prayer, addressed to our Father in heaven. Having, with the petitions dictated by our divine Master, called upon the Father, from the throne of His majesty we turn our prayerful voices to Mar)'. Thus is confirmed that law of merciful mediation of which we have spoken, and which St. Bernardine of Siena thus expresses: 'Every grace

granted to man has three successive steps: by God it is communicated to Christ, from Christ it passes to the Virgin, and from the Virgin it descends to us.' " 17

The following year he repeated the same doctrine: "From her heavenly abode she began, by God's decree, to watch over the Church, to assist and befriend us as our Mother; so that she who was so intimately associated with the mystery of human salvation is just as closely associated with the distribution of the graces which for all time will flow from the Redemption." 18

"From her, as from an abundant spring, arc derived the streams of heavenly graces. 'In her hand arc the treasures of the mercies of the Lord.' God wills that she be the beginning of all good things."19

St. Pius X writes: "From this community of will and suffering between Christ and Mary, 'she merited to become most worthily the reparatrix of the lost world' and dispenser of all the gifts that our Savior purchased for us by His death and by His blood.

"It cannot, of course, be denied that the dispensing of these treasures is the particular and supreme right of Jesus Christ, for they are the exclusive fruit of His death, who by His nature is the Mediator between God and man. Nevertheless, by this union in sorrow and suffering, as we have said existed between the Mother and the Son, it has been allowed to the august Virgin 'to be the most powerful mediatrix and advocate of the whole world with her Divine Son.' The source, then, is Jesus Christ, 'of whose fullness we have all received.' . . . But Mary, as St. Bernard justly remarks, is the 'channel' or, if you will, that connecting portion by which the body is joined to the head and by which the head exerts its power and its virtue: 'For she is the neck of our Head by which He communicates to His mystical body all spiritual gifts.' " 20

Pope Benedict XV teaches the same doctrine when he says that if all the graces of redemption are distributed by the Blessed Virgin by reason of her compassion, surely the grace of a holy death also comes from her hands.21 Pope Pius XI refers to her as the "depositary of all graces" 22 and he exhorted the faithful to pray to the Sacred Heart through the mediation of Mary, who is the mediatrix of all graces.23 In another place he refers to Mary as the administrator of heavenly graces.21

Sacred Scripture. "I will put enmities between thee and the

woman, and thy seed and her seed. She shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel" (Gen. 3:15). In these words Mary is united with Christ in her fight against Satan and ultimately wins a complete victory over him. Now, Mary's participation with Christ in this combat is not completed simply by her basic cooperation through her physical maternity nor by her proximate cooperation in the work of redemption, but it requires her intervention in the distribution of graces. The reason is that although *objective* redemption was consummated on the Cross and the price of our redemption was fully paid there, *subjective* redemption, by which His graces are applied to mankind, is still necessary. Both objective and subjective redemption constitute a complete whole, the total work of redemption, with the result that no one would have been restored to the supernatural order by objective redemption alone,23 for redemption tends directly to re-establish all things in Christ, both those in heaven and those on earth (Eph. 1:9-10; Col. 1:13-20). And actually, any grace that is the beginning of this restoration of Christ's reign and the constant and perpetual victory over Satan, requires Mary's mediation in the distribution of graces.

In the Gospel we meet a kind of prelude to the office and privilege of Mary in the distribution of Christ's graces. The first recorded grace that issued from Christ was the sanctification of John the Baptist, who leaped in his mother's womb when the Blessed Virgin, still carrying Christ in her womb, greeted Elizabeth. This privilege was bestowed upon John through Mary's mediation, as Elizabeth indicated when, filled with the Holy Spirit, she said: "For behold, the moment that the sound of thy greeting came to my ears, the babe in my womb leaped for joy" (Luke 1:44).

The same is true of the first miracle of Christ's public life, that of the conversion of water into wine in Cana of Galilee. As St. John says: "This first of His signs Jesus worked at Cana of Galilee; and He manifested His glory, and His disciples believed in him" (2:11). It was through Mary's mediation that Christ worked this miracle, as St. John attests, repeating the Virgin's words: "They have no wine. . . . Do whatever He tells you" (2:3-5).28

Pope Leo XIII says of these two graces: "During His private life on earth, He associated her with Himself in each of His first two miracles—the miracle of grace, when at the salutation of Mary the

infant leaped in the womb of Elizabeth; the miracle of nature, when He turned water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana."[27]

The Fathers and Theologians. This testimony can be divided into four epochs. The first extends from apostolic times to the eighth century; the second extends to the fifteenth century; the third, to the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception in the nineteenth century; and the fourth reaches to the present time.

First *Epoch.* The patristic doctrine of the first centuries concerning Mary's distribution of all graces is found implicitly in the title hailing Mary as the new Eve, which can be understood as an affirmation of her universal mediation and her spiritual maternity. In naming Mary the new Eve, the early Fathers present her as opposed in every way to the first Eve and associated with Christ to bring salvation to the world. The comparison can be found in the writings of St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, St. Ephrem, St. Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine and others.[28] And this comparison in which Eve is portrayed as the cause of death and Mary is designated as the cause of life is not restricted to the fact that Mary gave us Christ, who is the source of all graces, but that she was, in addition to Mother, the consort and spouse of Christ in the work of the restoration of the human race (as Eve was in its fall), and that she cooperated with Christ in the work of redemption in the two aspects of the acquisition and the distribution of graces.

As regards Mary's mediation, we have the testimony of St. Ephrem, St. Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom, St. Basil and St. Andrew of Cretona.[20]

Testimony to Mary's spiritual motherhood of all the faithful can be found in St. Epiphanius, St. Augustine and St. Peter Chrysologus, who show that Mary's spiritual maternity is either identified with her role as dispenser of graces or it follows by logical necessity from her role as dispenser of graces.[80]

Finally, some of the Fathers enumerate many of the graces which have come to us through Mary, and seem to defend her immediate cooperation in the distribution of all graces. Thus, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Modestus of Jerusalem and St. Andrew of Cretona attribute to Mary's mediation the veneration of the Cross, the victory over Satan, the conversion of unbelievers, the return of nations to God,

the remission of sins and rebirth in grace and, indeed, man's entire participation in grace and glory.[81]

Second Epoch. From the eighth century onwards, we find not only the doctrine of Mary's universal mediation, but also that all heavenly benefits reach us through her, a doctrine which would be clearly stated and defended in the twelfth century. St. Germanus of Constantinople says that no one can attain salvation without Mary's aid;[82] St. Anselm begs Mary to bestow grace on him because without her help he can achieve nothing;[83] St. Bernard teaches that God does not grant any grace which does not pass through Mary's hands;[84] St. Albert the Great says that Mary is the universal dispenser of all giaces.[88] Similar teachings can be found in the writings of St. John Damascene, St. Theodorus, Eadmer, Hugh of St. Victor, St. Amadeus, Cardinal Hugo, Richard of St. Lawrence, St. Bonaventure, Conrad of Saxony, Raymond Jourdain, Gerson, St. Bernardine of Siena and Denis the Carthusian.[80]

Third Epoch. The doctrine of Mary's cooperation in the distribution of graces was attacked in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by Protestants and Jansenists. But God gave the Church numerous zealous teachers, writers and preachers who defended Mary against her enemies, promoted her devotion intensively, and strengthened the doctrine of her cooperation in the distribution of graces. St. Peter Canisius, valiant defender of Marian prerogatives, explains the constant influence of Mary in the work of our salvation by citing the Scriptural phrase, "I will put enmities between thee and the woman," and applying the words to Mary, who was chosen by God to crush the head of the serpent.[87] The holy Doctor then defends the truth of Mary's universal mediation in the distribution of graces.[88]

St. Robert Bellarmine and St. Lawrence Brindisi refer to Christ as the Head of the mystical body and Mary as the neck, through whom all graces flow from Christ to mankind.[80] St. John Eudes states that Mary, as the second cause and dependent upon her Son, distributes all graces and all the fruits of the Passion.[40]

St. Alphonsus Liguori affirms that it is impious to assert that God is not pleased to grant graces at the intercession of His saints, and more especially of His Mother, whom Jesus desires so much to see

loved and honored by all. The honor bestowed on a mother redounds to the honor of the son. There can be no doubt that by the merits of Jesus, Mary was made the mediatrix of our salvation, not indeed a mediatrix of justice, but of grace and intercession. The intercession of Mary is even necessary for salvation, not absolutely, but morally. Tliis necessity proceeds from the will itself of God, that all graces He dispenses should pass through the hands of Mary.[41]

St. Louis Grignon de Montfort states that Christ communicated to His Mother all that He had acquired by His life and death, His infinite merits and admirable virtues, and He made her the treasurer of all that the Father had given Him. It is through her that Christ dispenses all His merits and graces. It is God's will that we have everything in Mary.[42]

Similar statements can be found in the writings of Bossuet, St. Francis de Sales, Leonard of Port Maurice, Salmerôn, Suarez, Salazar, Vega, Blessed John of Avila, Blessed Alphonsus of Orozco, Venerable John Palaphox, Nieremberg and many other authors.[43]

Fourth Epoch. Pope Pius IX solemnly defined the Immaculate Conception on December 8, 1854. It is truly a transcendental definition, not only because of the dogmatic affirmation of so excellent a Marian prerogative, but because it authentically declares that Mary's cooperation with Christ in the work of redemption is a traditional doctrine of the Church. Tliis document, together with the Marian encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and his successors, stimulated theologians to study and explain the privileges of Mary, and above all, her prerogative as dispenser of graces. With rare exceptions, most doctors, writers and preachers of the Church defended this doctrine of Mary's dispensation of each and every grace granted to men. It would be an interminable task to cite all the writers here. Moreover, students interested in such a bibliography will normally have easy access to it in recent books on the subject.

The *piety of the faithful.* By common instinct and devotion, all the faithful at all times and places have had confident recourse to Mary' for all their spiritual and corporal goods. Hence, the frequent and even daily invocation of Mary, both privately and publicly; the devotion of tire faithful to her; the many monuments, chapels, paintings and statues, which are an authentic expression of Marian piety and confidence in her protection; the many writings, books, prayer-

books, hymns and popular songs, which acclaim her the refuge of sinners and help of Christians.

Theological Arguments. Theologians usually offer a fourfold theological reason, based on the Virgin's divine maternity, her cooperation in redemption, her spiritual motherhood and her dignity as Queen.

By *reason of her maternity.* As the Mother of God, Mary touches the borders of the divinity, enters in a certain way into the hypostatic order, is closely united to Christ, is placed over all creatures, and attains the plenitude of all types of graces. Although the dispensation of graces is not a property of the divine maternity, but is rather an office which can be separated from it, it is most fitting that the Mother of God be adorned with such a prerogative. The reason for this is that operation follows being, and the more perfect the agent, the closer it is to God and the greater must be the influence of its causality.[44] Since Mary by her divine maternity is united to the Word by a most intimate union, she belongs, in a certain way, to the order of the hypostatic union and is superior in grace to all creatures. Therefore, she has the maximum capability of receiving the causality of dispensing graces to the rest of men. As Kerkhofs says concerning this proposition: "The order of creatures is not only a static order, but is primarily dynamic, based on the graded activity of beings. Grace, like life itself, tends to radiate and, in particular under the title of divine friendship, in the proportion that it grows, it increases the merit or impetrative power of the one possessing it and places at his disposal the riches of the divine Friend.[45]

By *reason of her cooperation in redemption.* Mary is the new Eve, Christ's partner in the work of redemption. Christ the Redeemer merited for us *de congigno* all the graces and helps necessary for salvation; and Mary, associated with the Redeemer, obtained them for us by her particular merits. St. Thomas says that it is logical that the one who acquired goods for others should dispense them.[45]

Moreover, total redemption has two aspects: objective and subjective. By the first, graces are acquired and accumulated; by the second, they are distributed to each of the redeemed. If in the first aspect the Virgin is intimately united to the Redeemer, why must we separate her from the second?

By *reason of her spiritual motherhood.* Mary is the spiritual

mother of men. Tin's maternity demands, in some way, the office of preparing and giving the grace by which all arc born to the new life and brought to their full development and perfection by its increase, because the perfection of the being belongs to the one who gave it existence.

By *reason of her dignity as Queen*. Mary is Queen in the kingdom of Christ in the formal and proper sense, inasmuch as she directs men to their eternal salvation. But Mary could not exercise this regal office if she did not intervene in the dispensation of grace to all men.

t h e s i s: *When Mary began to exercise the office of dispenser of graces.*

We must distinguish two economies: that of the Old Law and that of the New Law. With respect to the dispensation and distribution of graces, there exists a great difference between the two; not that grace was not conferred in the Old Law, but because, as St. Leo says, in the New Law it was bestowed more abundantly.47 St. Thomas says: "The New Law . . . consists chiefly in the grace of the Holy Ghost: which it behooved not to be given abundantly until sin, which is an obstacle to grace, had been cast out of man through the accomplishment of his redemption by Christ."48

Tliis more abundant effusion of graces, proper to the New Law, had its beginning after our Lord's resurrection and not before, as Toledo attests in his commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (c. 4). Although all of the Savior's merit arises from His passion and death, by which He merited for us the pardon of our sins and our justification, and not from His resurrection, by which He passed from the state *in via,* which is necessary for merit, nevertheless His resurrection is the terminus and complement of the passion and death of Christ. Through it He became the Redeemer in a complete sense, the victor over death and sin.49

God wished to sanctify us through the humanity of Christ, but absolutely speaking, He could have done it in another way. Moreover, He could have sanctified us through Christ's humanity without glorifying it. However, it was divinely decreed that the power of infusing grace, which was proper to Christ by reason of His in-

carnation, should be exercised through the passion and resurrection conjointly.

It is certain, as we shall prove in the following question, that all the graces received by men at any time were dispensed by Christ through Mary', although the graces granted to those who existed before Christ and Mary were bestowed through their intercession and merits as foreseen by God from all eternity and applied prior to any actual intervention by Christ or Mary. In the present question we treat principally of Mary's actual intervention in the distribution of graces, that is, the time at which she began to intervene in the distribution of graces.

Three stages can be distinguished in the life of the Blessed Virgin. The first extends from her immaculate conception to the incarnation of the Word; the second, from the Incarnation to Christ's death and resurrection; the third, from Christ's resurrection to Mary's assumption into heaven. Likewise, two kinds of Marian intervention may be distinguished: one common or general, which refers collectively to all graces and those to whom these graces arc given, by means of a universal mediation; the other particular, by which each distinct grace reaches each individual person. There are those who assert that Mary's general or universal mediation began at the very moment of her immaculate conception.50 Mary's particular mediation in the distribution of graces can be exercised in two ways: by an explicit and distinct knowledge of graces and of persons, or by an implicit knowledge which is contained in Christ's explicit and distinct knowledge. Endowed as He was from the very instant of His incarnation with beatific knowledge, He knew all men, their thoughts, actions, needs and the helps which could save them. That Mary could intervene in the distribution of graces in particular by an implicit knowledge, or through the medium of Christ's knowledge, can hardly be doubted, since she could unite her prayer to that of Christ and will the graces that Christ would will in particular for each man.51 As regards Mary's particular intervention by an explicit and distinct knowledge of grace and of persons, it cannot be denied that Mary concurred in this way with the distribution of grace during her lifetime, as in the cases of John the Baptist and in the conversion of the good thief. The latter was converted, says St. Peter Damian, because

the Blessed Virgin prayed for Him at the foot of the Cross." This particular intervention can be extended to those moments of her mortal life in which, enlightened by divine revelation, she understood distinctly the needs of men and obtained for each of them the necessary graces. This seems especially applicable to the time which elapsed between Christ's ascension and Mary's assumption, because, according to St. Peter Canisius, it was most fitting and because the growing Church had need of Mary's help for some years after her Son's ascension.[68]

But actually, Mary's full exercise of the office of dispenser of graces began on the day of her glorious assumption into heaven. Since that time she intervenes in the distribution of every grace to each soul because, illumined by the light of glory, she knows the spiritual needs of men, intercedes for them and distributes the graces they need. Hence Pope Leo XIII says: "Nobody knows and comprehends so well as she everything that concerns us: what helps we need in life; what dangers, public or private, threaten our welfare; what difficulties and evils surround us; above all, how fierce is the fight we wage with the ruthless enemies of our salvation. In these and in all other troubles of life her power is most far-reaching. Her desire to use it is most ardent to bring consolation, strength, and help of every kind to children who are dear to her." [64]

St. Andrew of Crete says that the whole world has Mary as a common mediatrix.[66] St. Amadeus of Lausanne says that our Queen is constantly before the divine Majesty, interceding for us with her most powerful prayers, because she knows all our needs as a mother who has compassion on us.[60]

Truly, once in heaven, Mary contemplates the essence of God more clearly and perfectly than any other creature. But all the blessed see in God whatever pertains to them. Therefore, it is certain that the Blessed Virgin must know everything that pertains to the salvation of men, both in general and in particular. To this unique knowledge which Mary receives from the vision of God is joined an extraordinary power, and to that power, an ineffable love.[67]

thesis: *The extension of Mary's prerogative as dispenser of graces; that is, whether it extends to all men of all times and even to the angels.*

From what has been said it is evident that under the New Law all graces are given to men through Mary. The present question treats, in a special way, of those who lived prior to the institution of the Christian law, including the angels.

Mankind may be considered either in the state of innocence, as was the condition of our first parents before the fall, or under the natural law and the written law, after the sin of our first parents. After original sin, men received all the graces and helps necessary for salvation through the merits of Christ, to which were united the merits of Mary, as they existed in the foreknowledge of God. With regard to the merits of Christ, Scripture states clearly: "God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of believers" (I Tim. 4:10); "He is a propitiation for our sins, not for ours only but also for those of the whole world" (I John 2:2); and "Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

To save men and to be a propitiation for their sins is proper to Christ as Head, according to St. Paul: "He is the Head of His body, the Church" (Col. 1:18). This is to be understood in its most universal sense, as the source from which every soul receives the influx of grace, as expressed by St. John: "And of His fullness we have all received, grace for grace" (1:16). Therefore, every grace, no matter how little, is given by Christ to all men who existed in any age of the world after the sin of Adam. St. Augustine explicitly says that all the just who have ever lived since the beginning of the world have received their grace through Christ.[68] St. Thomas says: "This is the difference between the natural body of man and the Church's mystical body, that the members of the natural body are all together, and the members of the mystical body are not all together; neither as regards their natural being, since tire body of the Church is made up of the men who have been from the beginning of the world until its end."[69]

There is no inconsistency in stating that Christ, before becoming man, was the Head of those who preceded Him in existence, because all received faith, grace and the rest of the supernatural gifts by-reason of the divine foreknowledge of the merits of Christ. And although Christ was not their Head in the same measure that He is ours,[80] nevertheless the influx of grace that came to them through

the merits foreknown by God and as an antecedent effect of Christ's passion, was sufficient to make Him Head of all.

The same must be affirmed of the Virgin, Mother of God, with respect to those who preceded her on earth, since Mary is the spiritual mother of all of those of whom Christ is the Head, and Christ is the Head of all men, of every age of the world. St. Bernardine of Siena says that he has no doubt but that all the mercies granted by God under the Old Law were granted only in consideration of this most Blessed Lady.®l

Because of the various opinions on the final cause of the Incarnation, theologians are not in agreement concerning the dependence of the grace of Adam and Eve in the state of innocence on the merits of Christ and of the Blessed Virgin. Those who believe, with the Scotists, that the Incarnation was decreed by God for the glorification of Christ and the beauty of the universe, antecedent to the divine foreknowledge of sin, logically conclude that Mary would have been chosen as the Mother of God even if Adam had not sinned and that grace, even in the present order, would have come to our first parents in the state of innocence through the influence of Christ and the cooperation of Mary with Christ, but subordinate to Him. For the Scotists Christ appears in the actual decree and the historical order of the Incarnation first as Head and end of the entire universe and Firstborn among creatures and only after the foreknowledge of sin as Redeemer of the human race.

But we favor the opinion of the Thomists, who maintain that the Incarnation was ordained simply as a remedy for sin and decreed by God after the foreknowledge of sin. And since in that decree of the Incarnation Christ appears primarily as Redeemer of the human race and Mary as His Mother, it follows that the grace of our first parents in the state of innocence does not proceed from the influence of Christ and Mary's cooperation.

Actually, the sanctification of our first parents in the state of innocence was foreknown and willed before the prevision and election of Christ and His Mother. Therefore, it is not possible that grace could have been given through them. The reason is that Christ and His Mother were foreknown and chosen after the prevision of Adam's sin, so that if Adam had not sinned, neither Christ nor His

Mother would have come into the world. St. Andrew of Crete refers to this when he says that had there been no Cross, neither Christ nor Mary would have come to the earth.®'

With regard to the angels, it is necessary to distinguish between essential and accidental grace and glory. The influence of Christ and His Mother on the essential grace and glory of the angels falls under the same controversy concerning the final cause of the Incarnation. According to St. Thomas, Christ, and consequently. His Mother, exercised no influence over the essential grace and glory of the angels, since the justification and glorification of the angels is prior to the prevision of Christ, for He and His Mother were foreknown and willed after the prevision of the sin of Adam. This sin presupposes the existence and suggestion of the devil, his fall, and the loss of grace in which he had been created, as it also presupposes the existence of the good angels who persevered in grace and were glorified. St. Bernard says that the angels did not need the passion of Christ and the devils could not profit from it.·* The angels, therefore, did not receive essential grace and glory through the influence of the God-Man and His Mother. St. Thomas says that "this was done by Christ inasmuch as He is the Word of God." **

Nevertheless, through the merits of Christ and His Virgin Mother, the angels received certain graces of ministry and accidental joys in the salvation of men. St. Thomas says the angels are not wayfarers, and hence Christ did not merit for them as regards essential reward. But since they serve us, they are in some sense connected with wayfarers, and since Christ merits for them in this regard, He does somehow merit accidental reward for them.®5

Mary's Causality in the Distribution of Graces

The doctrine of Mary's intervention in the distribution of all graces would not be fully explained if the statement of so remarkable a prerogative were not followed by a discussion of the manner and type of causality by which Mary exercises her influence over the graces bestowed on men.

t h e s i s: *Mary cooperates in the distribution of grace by way of intercession.*

Since we shall ticat later of Mary's intercession, it is sufficient to indicate here that Mary cooperates in the dispensation of graces by her merits and by her intercession, which is explicit and formal, interpretative and objective. This manner of cooperation by intercession admits of no doubt whatever, as it follows from the teaching of the Roman Pontiffs, the teachings of the Fathers and theologians, the liturgy of the Church, the common sentiment of the faithful, and the arguments of theological reasoning, so that no Catholic has dared to doubt it. This said, we pass on to the study of the kind of causality by which Mary intervenes in the distribution of graces.

t h e s i s: *Mary is not a moral instrumental cause in the distribution of graces, but a co-agent or less principal moral cause.*

Previous observations. It was common for the ancient theologians to divide the causes into the material, formal, efficient and final cause. The material cause is that from which something is made, that is, the subject from which the effect is produced, lire formal cause is that which determines the material in order to produce a distinct and determined effect. The efficient cause is that which produces something by its own action. The final cause is that which induces the efficient cause to work.

Philosophy is wont to distinguish the efficient cause in various ways. With regard to ourselves, we divide it into physical and moral. The physical cause is that which produces the effect with physical efficiency; the moral cause is that which produces the effect, not physically but in intention, that is, by its dignity, merit, value, example, petition, etc., it moves another cause to produce the effect physically.®*

Both physical and moral efficient causes are divided into principal cause, co-agent and instrumental cause. Tire principal physical cause, by virtue of its very nature, produces an effect proportionate and similar to itself. The co-agent or lesser principal cause influences the effect efficiently but with dependence on the principal cause, in such a manner that without its concursus the former has no influence on the effect. The physical instrumental cause produces the effect not so much by its own power as by that of the principal agent which

moves it and elevates it to the production of an effect superior to itself.

The moral efficient cause is also divided into principal cause, co-agent and instrumental cause. The principal moral cause, by its very nature and permanent form, moves intentionally, that is, by its dignity, value, example, petition, etc. The co-agent or less principal moral cause has, through its dignity and excellence, the power of moving intentionally, but originating from and dependent on the principal moral cause with which and under which it works. The instrumental moral cause moves intentionally, not through its own dignity and excellence, but by that which is communicated to it by the principal cause, to which it is subordinate and through which it works.

It is clear that we are not treating here of Mary's influence in the distribution of graces as a material or formal cause. Grace has no formal cause, because it is itself a kind of form, whether as a quality because formally it causes justification in man, or as second act because it prepares man for justification or, after being justified, it enables him to produce supernatural acts.

Moreover, grace has no material cause *ex qua* which forms part of grace, though it does have a material cause *in qua,* that is, a subject (the essence of the soul) from whose obediential potency it is produced and on which it relies for its existence.*7

It is certain that Mary does not exercise an influence as final cause in the distribution of grace because the proximate final cause of grace is the eternal salvation of the just, the mediate final cause is Christ, and the ultimate end is God, since all the works produced by God, of which grace is the principal one, arc ordained to His glory. Thus, we read in Proverbs: "The Lord hath made all things for Himself' (16:4), and St. Paul says: "For all things are yours, and you are Christ's and Christ is God's" (I Cor. 3:22-23). The Council of Trent explains the final cause of grace by stating that the causes of justification are the glory of God and Christ and also eternal life (Sess. VI, c. 7).««

With regard to the efficient cause, we say that God alone is the principal physical cause of grace because He alone can produce, by llis own power, all supernatural gifts. It is proper to the principal cause to work in virtue of its own form, to which the effect must be

similar, and since grace is a participation in the divine nature, it 0 identified wth God as principal cause. So St. Paul says: "There u but one God who will justify" (Rom. 3:30).

The principal moral cause is Jesus Christ, who by His passion and death merited for us *de congigno* all graces and supernatural gifts, because the meritorious cause of the gift or reward is its moral cause, and there can be no cause superior to Christ from whom merit could proceed as from a principal cause, since God, who is superior to Christ as man, cannot merit. The one who merits is inferior to the one who rewards, and God is not inferior to anyone and cannot hope for or receive any reward from anyone.®8 For that reason, the Council of Trent says: "The efficient cause is a merciful God; ... but the meritorious cause is His most beloved only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ."70

From all this it is easy for us to conclude that Mary does not exercise any principal causality whatever with respect to the production of grace, neither physical, as is evident from the words of St. Pius X: "We are thus, it will be seen, very far from declaring the Mother of God to be the author of supernatural grace," nor moral, because Christ is superior to her, and her intercession and merit depend on Him. It remains, therefore, to determine whether, in the distribution of graces, Mary is a moral co-agcnt and less principal cause or merely an instrumental cause.

Testimony of Theologians. St. Albert the Great: "Mary was not chosen by God to be a minister, but a consort and helper." 71

Denis the Carthusian says: "Just as man did not lose paradise without the cooperation of the woman, so God did not wish to redeem him without a woman as co-cause in this work. Nevertheless, Mary did not cooperate with Christ as if He alone would not have sufficed. Of Himself, He was more than sufficient. Yet she cooperated with Christ in many ways and was in her own way a savior of the world."72

George of Rhodes: "In a true and proper sense Mary, the Mother of God, can be called redeemer of the world, but in a less principal sense and in a much less proper sense than Christ.'' 78

Suârez: "The first dignity of the Virgin is that she is the Mother of God, and to that is united her most singular manner of cooperating in redemption." 74

Theological Argument. Mary's causality in the distribution of all supernatural gifts, although inferior to the power of Christ, the principal cause, is higher than that of the ministers and sacraments of the New Law. The ministers and sacraments of the New Law are instrumental causes (at least in the moral order) with respect to the graces conferred upon men. Therefore, Mary's causality cannot be simply instrumental, but must be of a higher type.

As consort of Christ in redemption, Mary is the universal cause of our salvation and, therefore, of all the graces which concur in its attainment. We have already said that she is the helper and cooperator with Christ, not on the same level but subordinate to Him and completely dependent on Him. This is the unique position of Mary, according to St. Albert the Great's statement that Mary was chosen by God not to be His minister but to be His consort and helper.76 It follows from this that Mary's causality surpasses greatly the causality of ministers and the sacraments, since she has a power as extensive and free as that of Christ, though she exercises it in subordination to Him. Now Christ, as Soto says, is independent of the sacraments, because He can confer grace without them on whomever He wishes.70 Preserving the proper subordination to Christ, the same can be said of His Blessed Mother. The ministers of the sacraments, however, cannot bestow justification except through the sacraments, and the sacraments themselves are also instruments of grace, but inanimate ones, through which the condign merits of Christ and the congruous merits of Mary are applied to us. But only with dependence on Christ could Mary merit for us.

Moreover, Mary's cooperation in the distribution of grace, as a moral co-agent by way *of* intercession, is assured by the fact that Mary, constituted by God as treasurer and administrator of all graces, can, with dependence on Christ, dispose at will of all heavenly goods and treasures. Intercession is the expression of the will directed to God so that God will fulfill it, and therefore Mary's intercession in this matter is the expression of her desire that God should bestow grace. But the intercession of the Mother of God is unique not only by reason of her power of petitioning for graces, but also by reason of her power of distributing graces. Again, preserving proper subordination to Christ, Mary's intercession is comparable to the interpellation of Christ, which consists in His desire or the manifestation

of His redemptive will to which belongs the right of distributing the fruits of redemption. Simply by an act of His will, Christ disposes of those graces, distributes them and makes them reach us. In a similar way, Mary, associated with Christ in redemption, cooperates in the dispensation of graces by interceding or manifesting to Christ, and with Christ to God, her will to bestow this or that grace. This expression of the will is, by divine disposition, sufficient so that Mary may dispose of the graces and be the efficacious cause by which the} are bestowed on mankind.

Mary is never refused her intercession or the expression of her desire, but is always granted what she asks, for two main reasons: i) *by reason of her divine maternity,* from which arise ineffable relations between her and the Father, with whom she has the Son in common; between her and the Holy Spirit, by whose divine power she conceived Christ the Savior; between her and the Son, with whom, in interceding for us, she makes use of her maternal right, to which Christ responds by a certain obligation of always granting what she asks; 2) *by reason of her cooperation with Christ in the work of redemption,* since by her intimate union with Him, she merited *de congruo* all the redemptive graces which Christ merited *de condigno,* being of one will with Him in the redemption of the world."7

t h e s i s: *Mary does not exercise a physical instrumental causality in the conferring of graces.*

Previous Observations. Perhaps some would criticize the thesis as stated because it seems logical to deny to Mary a physical instrumental causality, for the simple reason that we have already admitted a moral causality of a co-agcnt or less principal cause. But in the opinion of many noted theologians, these two kinds of causality can co-exist in the same subject and in relation to the same effect, as is verified in Christ and in the sacraments of the New Law."

The opinion of the Thomists is that the humanity of Christ, as an instrument united to the Word, concurs with a physical causality in the production of graces and other supernatural effects. This is denied by the Scotists and many others. It is also the teaching of the Thomists that the sacraments of the New Law are not merely moral instruments, but physical instruments in the production of

grace. As regards Mary's physical influence in the distribution of graces as an instrumental cause, it is necessary to distinguish between the question of possibility and the question of fact.

That Mary *could* concur and work in the distribution of graces as an instrument of divine power is evident, for the same reasons of non-repugnance which prove this possibility in the sacred humanity of Christ as a conjoined instrument and in the sacraments as separated instruments. 'Iberefore, whoever admits this causality in the humanity of Christ and in the sacraments will not deny it in Mary, although it is not logically deduced from that." The question principally, is one of fact—whether Mary exercises a physical instrumental causality in the distribution of graces.

Opinions. Few theologians defend the physical instrumental causality of Mary in the distribution of graces. Cardinal Lepicier maintains that Mary, while on earth, was the physical instrument of the graces conferred by God, for example, in the sanctification of John the Baptist, in the illumination and sanctification of the shepherds, of the Magi, and so forth. This causality may also be attributed to Mary after her assumption into heaven, although not with such clarity and certainty.80

Anthony Fernandez, O.P., maintains that the Blessed Virgin produces grace in the soul, not only morally, but also physically, as a separated instrument, much better than the ministers and sacraments of the New Law.81 Hugon defends this same type of causality, as do Lavaud and Bernard, who taught this causality openly at the Marian Congress of Chartres, later doubted it, and ended by stating that the question must be studied and thought out more profoundly.82 Two other modem theologians who defend this opinion arc Mura and Jacono.83

However, the majority of theologians deny that Mary exercises a physical instrumental causality with respect to grace. Suarez, who is very likely the only Scholastic theologian to treat this question, says that it is necessary to conclude that the Blessed Virgin is not a proper efficient or principal cause of our salvation. "This conclusion," says Suarez, "is most certain and even *de fide,* if it is understood of the first cause or even of the principal cause *per se of* our salvation. The Blessed Virgin is not God, which she would have to be in order to be the first cause of any effect, nor did she have the

power of justifying or of giving grace and glory. . . . If the conclusion is understood of any kind of efficient cause, whether principal or instrumental, it is not explicitly *de fide*. It is not found expressly in Scripture nor in tradition nor in the definitions of the Church. Neither can it be deduced from the principles of faith, but it is so certain that one could not say the contrary without temerity. It is completely without foundation and is alien to the teaching of all theologians, because the Blessed Virgin docs not of herself have this instrumental efficiency nor is there any reason or probable authority for stating that God would grant her any such causality. Rather, the Church teaches us that only the humanity of Christ is an instrument united to God in order to produce grace, and the sacraments are instruments of His humanity." [81]

De la Taille energetically rejects the opinion in favor *of* instrumental physical causality and goes so far as to call it a myth.·* Dickamp and Cuervo likewise reject the opinion.[8]

In supernatural matters which depend solely on the will of God, nothing can be affirmed arbitrarily or without positive foundation. But as regards Mary's cooperation in the distribution *of* supernatural gifts as a physical instrumental cause, Scripture and tradition are silent and it is impossible to support it with any theological argument of solidity.

Sacred Scripture mentions only the sanctification of John the Baptist in his mother's womb when Elizabeth was greeted by Mary. "And it came to pass, when Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary, that the babe in her womb leapt. . . . For behold, the moment that the sound of thy greeting came to my ears, the babe in my womb leapt for joy" (Luke 1:41–44). And Pope Leo XIII says of this: "St. John the Baptist, by a singular privilege, is sanctified in his mother's womb and favored with special graces, that he may prepare the way of the Lord; and this comes to pass by the greeting of Mary, who had been inspired to visit her cousin." [87]

At Mary's salutation, John was sanctified and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit, but it is not evident that its efficacy was physical. And even if physical instrumental causality were granted to Mary's salutation, the fact docs not transcend the limits of a particular and miraculous case, which in no way could be established as a universal law with regard to the distribution of graces. Therefore,

Sudrez states that if anyone were to maintain that on a particular occasion or by way of a miracle the Blessed Virgin was selected as an instrument for the sanctification of anyone, it would have to be denied, although it would not deserve a censure.[88]

In order to explain Mary's cooperation in the distribution of graces, some Fathers and theologians use terms which seem to signify a physical influence. St. Albert the Great says that all graces pass through Mary's hands numerically; St. Bernard calls her an aqueduct; St. Robert Bellarmine and St. Bernardine of Siena refer to her as the neck of the Church. Πιε metaphorical sense is readily seen under the sensible figure. The liturgy likewise uses such metaphorical expressions.

No solid theological argument can be found to attribute to Mary a physical causality in the distribution of graces. At most, some congniencics can be presented, taken from Mary's relations with the works of God. If God, for example, bestowed physical efficacy to the humanity of Christ and to the sacraments of the New Law, it seems fitting that the same causality would also be conceded to the Blessed Virgin. But the basis of this reasoning is entirely too weak.

Contcnson states that when theologians search for congruencies in the works of God, they must take them, not as conveniences of the work which must be realized, but of the work already realized, for if the effect had not been produced, adequate reasons could also be found to justify the non-existence of the effect. Therefore, the first fittingness of any work is the execution *of the divine will,* whose fulfillment is most fitting, but at the same time, reasons will not be lacking if the contrary had been decreed.[8]· Actually, reasons of convenience are not lacking to affirm the instrumental physical causality in Christ and the sacraments of the New Law but to deny it of Mary.

Theologians commonly call the humanity of Christ an instrument joined to the divinity. And since the divinity does not work by a moral causality, by petitions or merits, but by a physical causality in the production of supernatural effects, it is fitting that its instrument should conform to it and likewise exert a physical causality.

On the other hand, this enhances the dignity of the humanity of Christ, united to the Word hypostatically. Just as through this ineffable union, humanity is elevated to cooperation with the divine

Being, so it is also fitting that it be taken by the Person of the Word as an instrument united to it most intimately in the production of supernatural effects.

On the other hand, although the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of God touches the limits of divinity, pertains in some way to the hypostatic order and is Christ's consort in the work of redemption, she was not elevated to the status of a divine being nor united to God as a physical instrument to produce supernatural effects.

Whatever serves to manifest the divine perfection is most fitting, according to the Apostle: "His invisible attributes are clearly seen" (Rom. 1:20). The physical causality of the sacraments manifests God's sovereign power and dominion more clearly than through a moral influence, because lowly elements and simple actions are thereby elevated by divine power to sanctify men.

But physical causality bestowed on the Virgin in order to confer graces is not enumerated among the visible effects, and therefore would lack a proper end; that is to say, the divine perfection could not manifest itself through it in the effects produced. St. Thomas says: "There is no incongruity if sometimes anything is done outside the order of the inferior cause, to be ordered to the superior cause, as in human affairs the command of the president is passed over from obedience to the prince. So it happens that God works miraculously outside the order of corporeal nature, that men may be ordered to the knowledge of Him. But the passing over of the order that belongs to spiritual substances in no way belongs to the ordering of men to God, since the angelic operations are not made known to us, as are the operations of sensible bodies. Thus, the order which belongs to spiritual substances is never passed over by God; so that inferiors are always moved by the superior, and not conversely."[99]

Special Graces Distributed Through Mary's Intervention

Up to this point we have studied Mary's cooperation in the dispensation of graces in a general way. We shall now study it with respect to graces in particular.

Supernatural grace is multiform and is divided in many ways. In what concerns us, we shall divide it into internal and external. All divine gifts which are in us as in a subject are internal; all those gifts outside of us, which affect and lead us to salvation, are external. Internal grace is either *gratum faciens* or *gratis data,* insofar as it is conferred for the good of the one receiving it or is ordained to the benefit of others. Grace *gratum faciens* is further divided into habitual or sanctifying grace and actual grace, depending on whether it comes to us in a permanent way or as a gratuitous movement and transitory help. Thus, all the graces which justify us or dispose us for justification are internal; for example: sanctifying grace, the infused virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, the illuminations of the mind and the inspirations of the will; gifts by which we are made the adopted sons of God, live the divine life and work supernaturally.

To external grace belong many gifts or external benefits which lead us to salvation, such as the divine-positive law, revelation, the institution of the Church, the preaching of the faith, Sacred Scripture, the sacraments, good example, opportunities for good, and many others.

We do not intend to study the entire series of graces, but only those which present special difficulty or have special significance. We shall divide this material into three distinct parts: Mary's influence in the distribution of the graces conferred by the sacraments, Mary's cooperation with regard to the Most Holy Eucharist, and Mary's intervention with regard to the Church.

THE GRACES OF THE SACRAMENTS

The sacraments of the New Law confer grace *ex opere operato* on those who do not voluntarily impede it, and they do so by the power intrinsic to the sacraments themselves. Therefore, the sacraments can be compared to natural causes which infallibly produce their effects if the passive subject has the proper disposition. But the grace conferred by the sacraments is twofold: sanctifying grace and sacramental grace. The first is common to all the sacraments; the second is proper and different in each sacrament. The former is regained or

increased; the latter is not produced without the first.[81] Hence, the production of sacramental grace in the one receiving the sacrament is totally impossible without the reception of sanctifying grace.

If it be asked what sacramental grace adds to ordinary grace, it may be stated that it is not a new habit distinct from sanctifying grace, nor a new mode of intrinsic perfection, nor a special intrinsic vigor or power, but a right, annexed to sanctifying grace, of obtaining the actual graces necessary for the attainment of the end proper to each of the sacraments when needed.[82]

Thus, sacramental grace, inasmuch as it is an actual help ordained to the end of the sacraments, can be obtained, absolutely speaking, without the sacrament, for St. Thomas says that God did not bind His power to the sacraments, so as to be unable to bestow the sacramental effect without conferring the sacrament.[83] This is manifest in those who, not having received confirmation, profess their faith in a heroic way, and in those who, without the Eucharist, were raised to the highest sanctity, as was St. Paul the Hermit.

It is certain that the graces which are ordained to the ends of the sacraments and are conferred by God outside the sacraments in an extraordinary way in special necessities of the Christian life, depend upon Mary's intercession, as do all actual graces which in the present providence are bestowed on mankind. Nevertheless, it would be false to affirm that the graces produced *ex opere operato* by the sacraments are bestowed on men through the intervention of Mary without the sacraments, or at least without any ordination to the sacraments, since Mary conforms herself to the order established by God, according to which the sacraments are the ordinary means by which sanctifying grace is bestowed. So also with the increase of habitual grace, insofar as we must merit it, according to divine disposition, *ex opere operantis,* that is, by means of our good works, since Mary neither can nor wishes to obtain it for us by her intercession, without our performing meritorious works. Nevertheless, she obtains for us the actual graces required to perform those works.

This question treats principally of grace insofar as it is an effect of the sacraments of the New Law. Mary's indirect influence in this grace cannot be denied, whether it be a question of grace regained or an increase of grace. The Blessed Virgin obtains that the sacraments be imparted and received, since she cooperated remotely in

the existence of the priests of the Church, by whom the sacraments were to be administered. This she accomplished by giving her free consent in conceiving Christ, the Highpriest, whose priesthood, not derived from any other superior to His, is the fountain of all priestly power in the Church. Moreover, Mary's virginal womb was the temple where Christ received the anointing which constituted Him Highpriest. Hence, St. Denis of Alexandria states that our Highpriest was not consecrated by man nor was His tabernacle constructed by man, but by the Blessed Virgin Mary through the Holy Spirit and protected by the power of the Most High.[84]

Again, the Blessed Virgin Mary contributes in a more proximate manner to the priesthood of the Church, since she assists as a loving and willing mother in the election and spiritual formation of priests. Priests are the administrators of redemption, as Pope Pius XI points out in his encyclical on the priesthood, appointed to offer the immaculate Host and to dispense the other sacraments, which are, in a certain way, the rivulets through which the graces of salvation flow and pass on to men. Mary, who is the mother of the Eucharistic sacrifice, the most diligent custodian of the salvation of all, and the universal dispenser of the graces of redemption, procures, with maternal care, the election and spiritual formation of priests.[85]

The Blessed Virgin not only withdraws the obstacles which separate men from the sacraments, but she provides them opportunities for receiving them, moving them and drawing them to the sacraments. By her intercession she also obtains from God actual graces by which men prepare fittingly to receive the sacraments. It is well known that in the sacraments of the Church everyone receives grace according to the measure of his individual disposition and cooperation. Thus Mary, through her intercession, obtains this grace by which men are properly disposed to their reception.

We must omit the case in which the fruit of the sacrament is obtained without any disposition whatever, as occurs in little children, who receive the sacramental grace but perhaps in a minimum degree. The same can be said for anyone who receives the sacrament with only a habitual disposition and does not cooperate with it formally or virtually. Only a minimum amount of grace is then given, since the habitual disposition is only *removens prohibens* and in no way a disposition of cooperation.··

But as regards the direct influence on the graces which the sacraments produce ex opere *operato,* there is no difficulty whatever in attributing it to the Blessed Virgin, in conformity with the principles already established, though this influence is mediate. Mary merited with Christ, and subordinate to Him, the graces which the sacraments confer instrumentally, as she likewise merited that in the Church should be instituted the instrumental causes of salvation and channels of grace.'7

Finally, the direct and immediate influence over grace produced by the sacraments cannot be attributed to Mary, because when applied, they infallibly produce their effects as long as there is no obstacle. Through the institution and promise of Christ, the sacraments of the New Law arc infallible signs and causes of grace.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST

From what has been said, we gather that Mary, the Mother of God, made no small contribution to the institution of the Most Holy Eucharist, which has been called by St. Gregory of Nyssa the mystery of the Virgin. But it is fitting to determine, as far as possible, Mary's intervention in this mystery, studying at the same time, the admirable relations between the Blessed Virgin and the Holy Eucharist. This was the desire of Pope Pius XI, who, on the occasion of the Eucharistic Congress in Sydney, Australia, in 1928, urged the clarification, by means of diligent work and study, of the relation between the Virgin Mary' and the Holy Eucharist, which we encounter so frequently in the liturgy of the Church and in the writings of the Fathers and other saints.'' Since the Eucharist is at once a sacrifice and a sacrament, it is fitting to study Mary's intervention under both aspects.

t h e s i s: *Mary cooperated remotely in the institution of the* Holy *Eucharist, inasmuch as the body of Christ was formed in her by the power of the Holy Ghost, but not so far as Christ's flesh is the same flesh of the Mother of God.*

Errors. Some theologians in the Middle Ages, such as Ratramnus and Rabanus Maurus, denied that the body of Christ in the Eucha-

rist was the same as that bom of the Blessed Virgin. Paschasius Radbcrtus refuted them, proving invincibly the identity of the Eucharistic body of Christ and of His natural and historic body.[00]

Some French Catholics in the eighteenth century arbitrarily postulated a sacramental body of Christ distinct from the historic and heavenly one formed in the womb of Mary. They further held for a multiplication of bodies in relation to the numerical multiplication of the sacrament. They were opposed by Duguet in his dogmatic treatise on the Eucharist. Rosmini committed the same error when he said that Christ's natural body came from the earth and because it was composed of the blood of the Virgin, it could die; but His Eucharistic body is of a supernatural existence, comes from heaven, is living and vivifying, and therefore cannot be destroyed.[100]

There are others, like Suarez who maintain that Christ's flesh was not only taken from Mary's, which is true, but that Christ's flesh is the same as His Mother's and that the part taken from her always remained entirely the same and united to the Word of God.[101] It could logically be deduced from this that not only the flesh of Christ is present in the Eucharist, but the flesh of Mary also. This was actually taught by Ceferino de Someire, Vega and Basabe.[102]

First Part. The profession of faith, imposed on Berengarius by Pope Gregory VII, affirms, as a truth of faith, that the body of Christ in the Eucharist is the true flesh of Christ who was bom of the Virgin.[103] The same is set forth in the Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius XI to the Archbishop of Toledo, Spain, on the occasion of the National Eucharistic Congress celebrated in that city in 1926.

Fathers of the Church. St. Ignatius Martyr writes: "I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, who was made from the lineage of David.''[101]

St. Ambrose states that the Eucharist proceeds from the Blessed Virgin because it is "the true flesh *of* Christ, who was crucified and buried; therefore it is truly the Sacrament of His flesh. The Lord Jesus Himself exclaims: 'This is My body.' " [103]

St. Augustine says that "Jesus received His flesh from the flesh of Mary and He gave us His flesh to eat for our salvation." [10β] St. Martin and St. John Damascene speak in similar fashion.[107]

"And now, beloved brethren," says St. Peter Damian, "I beg you to consider how much we owe to this most blessed Mother of God

and the immense gratitude which we owe to her, after God. For that blessed body which the Virgin engendered, . . . we now receive at the altar and we drink His blood in the mystery of our redemption." [108]

The Liturgy. We need but refer to the Mass and Office for the Feast of Corpus Christi in order to find a proof of our thesis.

Theological Argument. We shall pass over the question of whether, absolutely speaking, the body of Christ could be present in the Eucharist before He had become incarnate in the womb of the Blessed Virgin.[108] Presupposing the institution of this sacrament as it exists today, the sacramental presence of Christ depends on His natural presence in heaven according to its own species, for the cause of Christ's presence in the Eucharist is the transubstantiation whereby the conversion is made into a pre-existing being which is in no way changed or modified. Consequently, the direct terminus of transubstantiation is the very body of Christ, born of the Blessed Virgin, immolated on the Cross for us, and now risen and glorified in heaven.

Second Part. Although the Blessed Virgin gave of the substance of her flesh so that the Holy Spirit could form the body of Christ in her womb, it cannot be said that the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist or in heaven is the very flesh of Mary. These are the reasons:

1) The doctrine of Zepherinus de Someyre was condemned by the Sacred Congregation as erroneous, dangerous, and scandalous, and the cult to Mary in the Blessed Sacrament was condemned.

2) The authors of this opinion tried to defend themselves by using the authority of St. Augustine, quoting from his sermon on the Assumption, inserted in the appendix of his works: "The flesh of Jesus is the flesh of Mary." But these are not the words of St. Augustine, but of Fulbert of Chartres. Moreover, those words taken out of context do not represent the teaching of Fulbert, who said that "the flesh of Jesus is the flesh of Mary much more than it is the flesh of Judas or the other brethren."

3) It is certain that the flesh of Christ was taken from the most pure substance of His Mother; but once it had received its own substantial form, which is the soul, and was united to the Word of God, it ceased being formally the flesh of Mary, since it was changed

substantially into a new form and it then belonged to the Divine Person of Christ.

4) For that reason it must not be said that in Christ there is anything of Mary, but that Christ was conceived of her; and therefore the flesh of Mary is not in the Eucharist, but the flesh of Christ, taken from the Blessed Virgin.[110]

t h e s i s: *By her free consent to the Incarnation, Mary also cooperated in the institution of the Eucharist.*

In his commentary on the parable of the woman who put three measures of leaven in flour, St. Bernard makes an application to the bread of angels which nourishes and strengthens man. He then exalts Mary, in whom this Bread was prepared, and states that her faith was the leaven infused into the Bread which is Christ.[111]

Rupert of Deutz states that at the Annunciation the heavens were opened and the Bread of heaven, the Bread of angels, which we would eat, came down.[112] Richard of St. Lawrence says that Christ is the living Bread which came down from heaven. The Blessed Trinity mixed the water of humanity with the wine of divinity and the Blessed Virgin did the same when she believed and gave her consent to that hypostatic union.[113]

The Eucharist is in a certain way an extension and complement of the Incarnation, not only because Christ continues to be present on earth, in all places and at all times, until the consummation of the world, but because the immense benefits of the Incarnation and Redemption are gathered wonderfully in this mystery and are lavished upon men. Now Mary, consenting to the Incarnation, consented, at least implicitly, to all the consequences of the same, among which is the grandeur of the Holy Eucharist.[114]

t h e s i s: *Mary cooperated proximately, as a moral cause, in the institution of the Eucharist.*

Previous Observation. Mary knew of Christ's intention concerning the Eucharist long before it was instituted. She had a profound knowledge of Scripture and therefore she could not have been ignorant of the Old Testament symbols which prefigured the Eucharist, for example, the manna from heaven, the sacrifice of Melchisedech, the paschal lamb, and the prophecies, chiefly that of Malachias

(1:10-11), in which the Eucharist is described as a clean oblation which was to replace the levitical sacrifices with which God was not pleased. Moreover, Mary understood perfectly the promise made publicly by her Son, that soon He would give the faithful His own body under the appearance of bread and wine. In addition, because of her intimate and familiar conversations with Him, she must have been very well instructed, as His associate in the mysteries, secrets and plans of redemption.

Taking all of this into consideration, it is a question of examining and understanding the manner in which Mary cooperated immediately in the institution of the Eucharist. We frequently find in authors the assertion that Mary cooperated in the institution of the Eucharist in the manner of a final cause, since she herself is the principal end *cui proximo,* in such wise that the Eucharist was instituted through her and for her, more than for the rest of the faithful. The reason given is that Christ instituted this admirable sacrament out of love for mankind, and it is certain that He must have loved the Blessed Virgin incomparably more than all men taken together. Lepicier adds that Christ instituted the Eucharist as a gift to Mary, thus returning to her the body she had given Him and also in order that by her fervent Communions she could atone for the coldness and ingratitude of men.[116]

But the question is whether Mary cooperated actively as a moral cause in the institution of the Eucharist. Moral causality can be exercised in many ways; for example, by desire, by supplication, by consent, and so forth. Mary actually cooperated in the institution of tire Eucharist in those three ways:

1) *By desire.* Words cannot describe how much Mary desired this Sacrament for herself, because nothing would be more delightful for her than to receive again into her purest breast that divine Word which she received into her virginal womb at the Incarnation. She also desired it for others, because she foresaw the glory which would come to Christ from so great a sacrament which would produce such abundant fruits of sanctity and engender such a multitude of just souls. Christ was perfectly aware of those desires of His Mother, and He could not let them go unfulfilled.

2) *By supplication.* Some theologians affirm that Mary's intercession in the institution of the Eucharist began at the marriage of

Cana. We must first observe that the conversion of water into wine at the marriage feast is an outstanding symbol of the Eucharist. St. Cyril of Jerusalem uses it as an argument for the Eucharistic conversion.,ie This miracle was performed through Mary's intervention by these words: "They have no wine." And Jesus said to her: "What wouldst thou have Me do, woman? My hour has not yet come." His Mother said to the attendants: "Do whatever He tells you" (John

That it was at this time that Christ thought of instituting the Eucharist, is insinuated by St. Augustine, when he says that the best wine which was saved till last was the wine of His blood.[117] St. Maximus of Turin states that when Jesus said that His hour had not yet come, He was promising the hour of His passion and the wine of redemption.[118] Yet St. Maximus denies that in asking for the miracle of the wine, Mary was likewise asking for the institution of the Eucharist.[110]

Notwithstanding, it is the opinion *of* some writers, like Silveira and Velâzquez, that at the marriage of Cana Mary petitioned Christ for the Eucharist. They base their opinion on the words of St. Irenaeus, describing Mary's eagerness to taste the miraculous wine, which they interpret to refer to the Eucharist.[120]

Be that as it may, Lepicier's argument is that just as the water was turned to wine at Mary's request, so also we owe the institution of the Eucharist to her intercession.[121] Truly, every supernatural good comes to us through the intercession of Mary, and of all gifts and benefits, the greatest is the Eucharist, because it contains the very substance of God incarnate, the author and fountain of all graces, who sanctifies us, unites us to Himself and makes us partakers of His divine life.

3) *By consent.* The Eucharist is like a continuation of the Incarnation.[122] Moreover, it is like a complement of the divine gift made to us at the Incarnation, since the Father deigned to give us the Son, according to St. John (3:16): "For God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son," and the Son also deigned to give Himself to men. He instituted this Sacrament in which He gives Himself to men in a most perfect manner, thereby completing the gift of the Father and His own total surrender. But the giving of the Son proceeded not only from the Father, but also from the

Mother, since in conformity with the divine will, Mary gave us the Son who was truly hers. Even more, consenting to the will of her Son, who offered Himself as a Victim for all, she herself offered Him to mankind. It was therefore fitting that Mary, since she intervened in the first giving, together with the Father and the Son, should also intervene in its consummation and complement by uniting her will to that of her Son in the institution of the Eucharist and sharing in His desire to give Himself as food and drink *for* men.123

t h e s i s: *Mary's influence on the reception of the Eucharist by the faithful.*

O b s e r v a t i o n s. At the Last Supper, Christ not only gave His body and blood as food to His disciples, as faith teaches us, but in the opinion of many, He Himself partook of the Eucharist which He had just instituted, both to complete the sacrifice and to give His apostles an example. Thus, the Fathers of the Twelfth Council of Toledo asked: "What kind of a sacrifice would that be *if we did* not acknowledge the Sacrificer as a participant in it?" 124

St. Thomas says: "But although grace was not increased in Christ through His receiving this Sacrament, yet He had a certain spiritual delectation from the new institution of this Sacrament. Hence He Himself said (Luke 22:15): 'With desire I have desired to eat this Pasch with you.' "123

It is probable, as pious and reputable authors commonly teach, that after having given the Eucharist to His apostles, Jesus also gave it to His Mother. And it was fitting that He should do so, since He had taken His flesh and blood from her and since she had cooperated in the institution of this Sacrament in so many ways.

If it is alleged that the Evangelists were silent concerning Mary's presence at the Last Supper, mentioning only the apostles, we answer that they alone are mentioned in the Gospel in order to show us that they were all ordained priests at this feast when Jesus said: "Do this in commemoration of Me." Mary was not ordained a priest, and therefore the Lord willed that she be absent from the Last Supper. Nevertheless, since Mary constantly accompanied Christ, it may be maintained that on that night, with the Passion so imminent, she was probably in the same house but in another room,

where, with the rest of the women, she received the Holy Eucharist.123

That Mary received Communion daily, from the day of Pentecost, is stated by St. Peter Canisius, who says that Mary received new graces and charisms and a higher degree of sanctity at the reception of Communion, which was received daily in the primitive Church.'22 In his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, he says that Mary was outstanding in the practices of piety so that the Mother of Christ would also be an example of virtue and holiness to all the faithful.123

Actually, Mary not only serves as an example to the faithful of all times with regard to frequent and even daily reception of the Eucharist, but she constantly influences the dispositions for proper reception of the Eucharist and the fruits which proceed from it. Although the Eucharist of itself produces spiritual delights in those who receive it, this must be understood not so much in the sense of spiritual consolation as in the sense of the strength it affords in suffering on the road to God. Thus, not only did the Virgin receive from the Holy Eucharist an extraordinary fortitude to be able to endure her Son's passion, but also the strength to overcome the difficulties and tribulations of the infant Church and to comfort the little flock of the faithful at that time.129 This should serve as a stimulus to us to approach the Eucharist more fervently, and, fed by the Bread of fortitude, to bear the labors, tribulations and miseries of this life in patience, in imitation of Mary.

Moreover, since in receiving the Eucharist we must prepare a dwelling, not for a man, but for God, it is absolutely necessary to be adorned with special dispositions. Mary presents herself as a perfect model of the desire, purity and the rest of the virtues which should adorn the soul that is about to receive the Eucharist. She naturally had an ardent longing to receive her Son in Communion. So we should also receive Communion with great longing. St. Gaudentius says that God does not wish us to receive His body and blood with cold lips and lukewarm heart, but with the greatest possible fervor, hungering and thirsting for true holiness.130 St. Thomas says that desire makes the one who desires apt and disposed to receive that which is desired.181

On the other hand, the Eucharist is the food of virgins; it is not

only the wine which engenders virgins, but it sustains and nourishes them, for between virginity and divinity there seem to exist certain bonds of secret affinity and intimate sympathy. For that reason Christ, a Virgin, wished to be born of a Virgin Mother and so He takes great delight in giving Himself as food to virgin hearts.!"

If divinity and virginity are so closely allied, we may consider how ineffably worthy must have been the dwelling which Mary prepared for Christ, she who by her virginity merited to become the ciborium of the divine Incarnation. Hence, how fitting that we, in receiving the Eucharist, be transformed in some way in Mary and live as if imbued with the example of her virginal virtues.

Further, Christ instituted tin's sacred banquet for the faithful for the purpose of infusing in them both life and death, so that living they might not live for themselves, but for Him who died for them. St. Gregory the Great insists that in applying these mysteries it is necessary that we sacrifice ourselves to God by a contrite heart, because those who celebrate the mystery of the passion of our Lord should imitate that which they handle with their hands. We shall offer to God a true victim for ourselves when we ourselves become victims."[3] In this also Mary is an excellent example, for while living on earth she became a holy victim through her perfect and total self-abnegation, not for herself, but for Christ.

Yet Mary not only offers herself as a model of the dispositions with which we should receive the Eucharist, but she also assists us constantly in the reception of its fruits. St. Bernard says: "We have heard thy voice in the Gospel, O Lady: 'They have no wine.' This voice is necessary to us. We are lacking the wine which gladdens the heart of man; we seek the wine which engenders virgins. . . . The chalice is in thy hands and in thy power. Give it to thy Son, O Lady, and tell Him: 'They have no wine.' "[184]

And surely all those who approach this Sacrament properly disposed are moved by the grace which is granted to them through the intervention of Mary. And this is fitting, because as the first Eve prevailed on the man to eat of the deathly forbidden fruit so the second Eve prompts man to eat of the Bread of life.

Moreover, all those whom Mary leads to the reception of the Eucharist, she prepares and disposes to receive greater fruit. The better disposed one is at the reception of this Sacrament, the more

copious is the grace he will receive. The Eucharist is the most fruitful of all the sacraments because it contains Christ Himself, who is the source of all graces, and it produces its effects according to the capacity of the one who receives it, just as the sun produces greater light and heat as the receptivity of the object exposed to its rays is greater. Therefore, he receives more graces from the Eucharist who is more pure of sin, has a more ardent love and is higher in sanctity. But all of these dispositions are fomented by the Blessed Virgin, to whom nothing is more pleasing than that those who approach the Blessed Sacrament should bum with the chaste desire to receive the Eucharist and should do so with intense love. For that reason, in the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom the intercession of Mary is petitioned for a more worthy reception of Communion: "Grant, O Lord, through the intercession of the immaculate and ever virgin Mary, that I may worthily receive Thy gifts."

Nor should it be forgotten that the Eucharist produces its proper effect by giving to the faithful the true body of Jesus Christ after the manner of a food which nourishes them spiritually, so that they may be more closely united with Christ and transformed in Him, and, as a consequence, that they may be more intimately united with one another as members of His mystical body. This is also something especially proper to the Blessed Virgin, because as the spiritual Mother of all the faithful it belongs to her to achieve this transformation in Christ for all her adopted children and to foment among them, as living members of the mystical body, that unity and charity which the Savior desired should prevail among all Christians.

Corollary. The duration of the Sacred Species in Mary after Communion.

The Sacred Species is usually destroyed shortly after its reception, ending the presence of Christ in the communicant. But it could happen that the Species would miraculously continue to be present in the communicant. The Venerable Mary of Agreda states in *The Mystical City of God* that this happened in the Blessed Virgin, in order that she might continually possess her Son sacramentally from the day of the institution of the Eucharist until her assumption. Father Faber[138] maintains that the Sacred Species remained in Mary during the Passion, beginning on the night of the Last Supper. Benedict de Alatri defends this permanency, commenting on the

revelation of Magdalen of Martinengo on the subject.1·· Father Basabe also advocates the perpetual sacramental dwelling of Christ in the heart of Mary, both for Christ's delight and that Mary would constantly receive new graces through the Eucharist.1" Julius Aremendia also defends this marvelous conservation of the sacramental species in Mary, calling her the living ciborium of the Holy Eucharist.188

We shall state our opinion on this matter as briefly as possible. In the first place, we cannot deny the *possibility* that the sacramental species could remain incorrupt in the Blessed Virgin, whether living on earth or even now in heaven. If God has the power to prevent the various natural powers from causing the corruption of the accidents of bread and wine, as seems to have happened sometimes in the history of the Church, then He could also prevent the Species from being corrupted after having been received into the human body. This would be especially true of a glorified body, which no longer has any need of the activity of the digestive organs.130

Secondly, as regards the *fact* of the conservation of the sacramental species in Mary, there are very few theologians and writers who defend this teaching. Tirus, Godinez states that it never even entered the minds of most theologians to raise the question of whether the Eucharist remained incorrupt in Mary and remains in her even in glory. Some authors, such as Nieremberg, Recupito, and Engelgrave, mention the point but do not dare to express an opinion, nor is it, in the mind of Godinez, even thinkable.140

As regards the conservation of the Blessed Sacrament in Mary during her life on earth and after the institution of the Eucharist, we must follow a middle course between absolute negation and excessive credulity. The recorded visions and revelations *of* Mary of Agreda, Magdalen of Martinengo and Catherine Emmerich are definitely in favor of the affirmative. However, private revelations should not be given any greater theological importance than that signified by Cardinal Lepicier in the following statement: "What is related to us in these writings can be read with profit in order to foment piety and faith if the material is in conformity with sound theology and the documents *of* the Fathers. Whatever is contrary to revealed doctrine must be totally rejected. Whatever is related in these writings concerning Christ and the Blessed Virgin, prescinding from the

testimony of Sacred Scripture, should be accepted with great reserve, especially if the matter concerns curiosities rather than serious and safe matters."141 Father de Guibert mentions the generally unfavorable reaction to private revelations which attempt to supplement public revelation concerning the events in the life of Christ or concerning certain theological questions, such as the revelations of Mary of Agreda and Catherine Emmerich, regardless of the personal holiness of these women.142

t h e s i s: *Mary's intervention in the Eucharistic sacrifice during her life on earth.*

In the Eucharistic sacrifice offered by priests as ministers of Christ, Christ is the principal priest. This was taught by the Fourth Lateran Council and also by the Council of Trent: "For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the Cross, the manner alone of offering being different." 143

It is also certain that the Church offers the Eucharistic sacrifice, as was taught by the Council of Trent: "In order to leave to His beloved spouse a visible sacrifice as human nature requires, (Christ) instituted a new Pasch: He Himself, through the mediation of His priests, would be immolated under visible signs by the Church." 144 And so it is that the Church offers the sacrifice through the priest because he was constituted the minister with the power of offering the sacrifice in Christ's name. But the priest is a member of the body of the Church. Therefore, his action, as the action of a member, is attributed to the whole body.148

Tire faithful offer the Eucharistic sacrifice in a general way by being members of the Church militant, in whose name the priest offers it, and essentially by assisting at the sacrifice and uniting their intentions to that of the celebrant.14"

Taking into consideration all that has been said, it must be asserted that while Mary was on the earth, she was intimately associated with the oblation of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Although she did not enjoy the prerogative of the principal priest, which belongs exclusively to Christ and she did not possess the sacramental priesthood, since she did not receive ministerial power, nevertheless it can be said that she offered the Victim of the altar in a singular manner, as she had

previously offered Him on the Cross. 'Hie reason for this is twofold.

First, Mary is the consort of Christ in the work of redemption. But the work of redemption is realized each time that Christ is immolated on the altar, as is stated in the liturgy.[147] Therefore, Mary could not be less intimately associated in the Eucharistic sacrifices celebrated while she lived on earth.

Secondly, Mary is the principal and noblest member of the Church; even more, she is the Mother of the Church. Hence she would participate in the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ which the Church offers, and would do so in a way most befitting its noblest member, who is also the Church's Mother, that is, by being united to the sacrifice with a fervent will and with the greatest devotion, as befits her spiritual maternity, fullness of grace, singular union with Christ and her ineffable cooperation in the sacred Passion, of which the Eucharist is the perpetual memorial.

t h e s i s : *Mary's influence on the Masses offered during her lifetime.*

It is certain that, on the part of Christ, the principal Priest, the value of the Mass never changes, since it will always be the clean oblation which cannot be stained by the indignity or malice of those who offer it. It is also certain that the value of the sacrifice can vary greatly, according to the merit, disposition and devotion of the priest offering it and of the faithful; but never does the sacrifice cease to be acceptable to God because of the wickedness of the priest, for even if he be lacking in devotion, the holiness and common devotion of the Church, which always recommends the sacrificial oblation and assures the acceptability of the same, remains intact.

Neither can it be doubted that the holiness and devotion of the Church increases or diminishes according to the times. The necessary holiness will never be wanting in the Church, as has been seen in the course of the centuries, nor is it possible that it be lacking, since God generously lavishes His graces and charisms on the Church and on her children. But the holiness of the Church may be greater at some times than at others, and the greater the holiness of the Church, the more acceptable is the sacrifice and the more copious its fruits.

Therefore, it must be said that the Eucharistic sacrifices celebrated while Mary lived on earth possessed an extraordinary value because

of the remarkable holiness of the Mother of God. The reason for this is that the fruits of the Mass which pertain to the whole Church as the offerer, are more or less according to the greater or lesser number of the just who offer it in the Church Militant and according to a greater or lesser holiness in its members. As Biel says, the merit of the Church is not an abstract merit which exists of itself as something separated from individual men, but it is the merit of the persons and members who constitute the Church.[148] Therefore, the fruits of the Eucharistic sacrifice in the time of Mary must have been tremendous because of her singular holiness, which surpasses that of the Church through all the ages.

De la Taille writes as follows concerning this question: "It is of the greatest importance that there be in the Church many saints, and even very great saints, and it is necessary to encourage and stimulate spiritual souls so that they will strive to increase daily the value of the Masses that are celebrated. . . . Do you want to know why, for long years after the day of Pentecost, the Gospel was so widely diffused in the world and the holiness increased in the faithful of the Church, until all were one heart and one soul in the ultimate perfection of charity, which is the summit of Christian perfection? Consider the Blessed Virgin Mary favoring all the sacrifices of the Church which were then celebrated in the world, and we cannot be astonished that since that time there has never been so miraculous an expansion of Christianity nor so great a progress in the spiritual life." [149]

t h e s i s : *Mary's intervention in the Masses celebrated after her glorious assumption.*

We may consider the Blessed Virgin as she is in the state of glory or so far as she is the consort of Christ the Redeemer, Mother of the Church Militant and universal dispenser of graces. In the first case, that is, so far as Mary is among the blessed in the state of glory, she must be judged in the same way as are the saints who now reside in heaven. These are united to us in charity, but they cannot offer with us the Eucharistic sacrifice in a common oblation. They are outside the visible Church, and it pertains only to the visible Church to use sensible signs of spiritual matters; and sacrifice is a sensible sign.

In the second instance, that is, so far as Mary is consort of Christ

the Redeemer, Mother of the Church Militant and dispenser of graces, she now possesses in glory no new type of intervention in the Eucharistic sacrifice, but neither is the celebration of the Mass in any part of the world alien to her. Mary in glory has no new intervention in the Eucharistic sacrifice because neither does Christ, the principal Priest (at least in the opinion of many theologians), place any new, formally oblative act in the sacrifice of the Mass. Moreover, although Christ actually intervenes in each and every Mass celebrated, uniting to the oblation of the priest some internal act by which He Himself is offered to the Father as dead on the Cross (a concept which is pleasing to many theologians), it should be said that this is proper to Christ alone, as the chief Priest in the Mass, in whose name and by whose power the human priest operates. This cannot be maintained of the Blessed Virgin.

Nevertheless, Mary is not alien to the celebration of the Mass. As the consort of Christ the Redeemer, she must for this very reason look down from heaven and assist at the sacrifice in a special manner and delight in its celebration in an extraordinary' way, for on the altar is renewed the immolation of that Victim of the sacred Passion, who is her own Son and from whom are obtained for men the immense and salutary fruits of redemption.

Moreover, Mary is the Mother of the Church and, therefore, she loves the Eucharistic sacrifice with a maternal love, because it nourishes and sustains the Church.150 St. Bonaventure says: "Take this Sacrament from the Church, and you will have in the world nothing but error and infidelity, and the Christian people will be no better than a herd of unclean animals, separated and given to idolatry, as can be seen among the infidels. But through this Sacrament the Church lives, faith is strengthened, Christian religion and divine worship are preserved." 151

Finally, as universal dispenser of graces, the Blessed Virgin actually intervenes in the diffusion of the fruits of the Mass. The fruits of the Mass are the effects it produces and they are applied to men. These effects are of two kinds: those for the glory of God and those for the benefit and utility of men, as is stated in the Ordinary of the Mass.

The primary effect of sacrifice is the glory of God, and it is attained by adoration or the cult of latria, by thanksgiving and the

reparation of the divine honor wounded by sin. Our utility is a secondary effect, dependent on the primary, since God, honored and appeased by the sacrifice, is moved to pardon us graciously and to dispense to us His divine favors. Our utility comprises the remission of sins and the punishment they deserve, as well as supernatural and even natural goods which help us to obtain eternal salvation. Those arc the effects which, in the proper sense, can be called fruits of the Mass.

Hence, the Sacrifice of the Mass is latrcutic, eucharistie, propitiatory and impetratory', and it produces its effects *ex opere operato,* that is, of itself, by the intrinsic power of the very action by which the sacrifice is effected. And this is independent of the unworthiness or malice of the one who offers it, as the Council of Trent teaches. If it depended upon the actions of the visible offerers, then it could be stained by their sin. This is most certain as regards the latreutic and eucharistie effect, because the Sacrifice of the Mass, considered objectively, as it proceeds from Christ, both principal Priest and Victim, is infinite adoration and infinite thanksgiving which must be infallibly and infinitely pleasing to God. But the adoration and thanksgiving also proceed from the Church and are also pleasing to God, but always in the measure of the Church's holiness. In like manner, so far as it proceeds from the priest and the faithful, it will please God or not in the measure of their dispositions.

As regards the effect of propitiation and impétration, we must take into consideration that the *opus operatum* cannot be understood of sacrifice in the same way as in the sacraments. The fruit produced *ex opere operato* in the sacraments consists in the infusion of sanctifying grace, conferred immediately on men, with the sacraments acting as instruments; but this sanctifying grace, produced in an immediate manner, is not the fruit of sacrifice, which, by way of supplication, does no more than move God to confer His graces on men.152

With all this in mind, we can determine the influence which the Blessed Virgin exercises over the salutary effects of the Eucharistic sacrifice. With regard to the latreutic and eucharistie effects proceeding from Christ, the Victim and principal Priest of the sacrifice, it is certain that Mary does not intervene in them in any way, since they flow infallibly and spontaneously from the very nature of the action. But in those same latreutic and eucharistie effects, as they proceed

from the Church, from the priest and from the rest of the faithful with whom he offers the sacrifice, and in which God can be more or less pleased, according to the holiness of the Church and the disposition of the offerers, the Blessed Virgin influences them as the "neck" of the Church which offers the sacrifice and as the advocate for the helps necessary so that the priests and the faithful may prepare themselves worthily and thus, more and more united to Christ, may be conformed to Him in offering to God the Host of eternal salvation.

With respect to the fruits of propitiation and of impétration in this sacrifice, the Blessed Virgin mediates indirectly and directly in their application to mankind. Indirectly, she draws them to this salutary fountain and obtains for them suitable graces to enjoy its fruits. St. Thomas says: "As Christ's passion benefits all, for the forgiveness of sin and the attaining of grace and glory, whereas it produces no effect except in those who are united with Christ's passion through faith and charity, so likewise this sacrifice, which is the memorial of our Lord's passion, has no effect except in those who are united with this Sacrament through faith and charity. [183]

Cardinal Franzelin remarks that Mary also has a direct influence on these fruits. Since the Sacrifice of the Mass is an application of the redemptive sacrifice, it can be called a new impétration of Christ to the Father, insofar as it presents to Him, by this renewed oblation, the merit obtained and consummated on the Cross.[184] Actually, Mary's intercession must not be separated from this objective impétration of Christ, by which He presents to the Father the merit consummated on the Cross, for what Christ merited *de condigno* on the Cross, she likewise merited beneath the Cross and with dependence on Him. Tire Church makes use of this intercession in the liturgy: "Hallow, we beseech Thee, O Lord, our oblations offered to Thee, and by the most salutary intercession of blessed Mary, Mother of God, grant that they may profit us unto salvation." [188]

THE CHURCH

Christ, our Lord, wished to establish the Church in order to perpetuate on earth the work of redemption and to make men share in its benefits.[8fl] Therefore, after having instituted all the means of salvation, such as revelation, the sacraments, etc., He commanded and charged His Church to apply them to men. In this way the sublime office of our Redeemer, who came into the world so that men might have life and have it more abundantly (John 10:10), would be continued to the end of time. Pope Leo XIII states that Christ made His Church the vicar of His mission."[1] Christ's redemptive mission is perpetuated in the Church He founded, so that in it and through it all men may, through the grace of Christ, attain their eternal salvation.

But Christ instituted the Church as a visible hierarchical society, possessing a twofold life: one exterior and social; the other, supernatural and interior. The Church, like any other society, can be said to be living when it works for the attainment of its end, through the rule and direction of authority and the obedience of its subjects. This is the external, social, visible life, by reason of which it can be said, although less properly, that its authority is, as it were, the soul which informs and directs the society.

But this exterior life is ordained to an interior life which immediately affects each of the members who live this life or can and should live it, that is, the supernatural life, whose principle or soul is sanctifying grace or the vivifying gifts of grace *gratum faciens,* by which the members live supernaturally in a proper and perfect manner when in the state of grace, or imperfectly and improperly if they possess only faith and hope or, perhaps, only share in actual graces.[188]

Since the work of sanctification and, therefore, the effusion of the supernatural gifts which vivify the soul are attributed by appropriation to the Holy Spirit, He is called the soul (or heart) of the Church. Thus, St. Augustine says: "What the soul is to the human body, the Holy Spirit is to the body of Christ; the Holy Spirit works in the Church what the soul works in all the members of the body." [188]

By reason of this double life, the Church is not only a moral body, as is any other society, but also a mystical body, through its mystical communication of the divine life of Christ, the Head, to all its members.

The present question concerns Mary's part in the constitution of the Church and the development of its life, whether exterior and social or interior and mystical.

In the Church we can distinguish a threefold state: a) an inchoate or initial state, corresponding to the time in which Christ announced and prepared for the Church; b) a state of fundamental existence, when by the death of Christ, the covenant of the Old Law was broken, the New Law between God and men was established, and the Church was bom; c) a state of formal existence corresponding to the moment in which the Church was formally constituted on Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit animated the organs by giving each its proper function and by imparting life, strength and continual growth to the whole body.''0

t h e s i s : *Mary's cooperation in the preparation of the Church.*

The Church is a consequence of redemption because it was established in order to perpetuate the work of redemption. Therefore, it was fitting that Mary, consort and helper of Christ in redemption, should also cooperate in the preparation of the Church. Christ prepared the foundation of His Church by preaching the kingdom of God and choosing followers, apostles and disciples. Although she did not preach the New Law nor choose apostles, Mary helped Christ in this mission by fulfilling her duties as Mother, sharing His pains and tribulations, praying to the Father for the success of that preaching and meriting the vocation of the apostles. For that reason, Denis the Carthusian says that to Mary is attributed the crown of the apostles, because they were called through her merits.101

Saintrain, speaking of the suffering Mar}· endured during our Lord s public life, says: "Let us not forget that she was given as a companion to the Redeemer, as a helper in the great work He came to accomplish on earth. It was necessary that she suffer, at least in her soul and by her compassion, all that He suffered in fact." 102

t h e s i s : *Mary's cooperation in the beginning of the Church, with regard to its fundamental existence, at the death of Christ.*

It is certain that the Church, in its fundamental existence, was bom at the death of Christ. Thus, it is affirmed in the Acts of the Apostles (20:28): "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit has placed you as bishops, to rule the Church of God, which He has purchased with His own blood." The

same doctrine is taught by the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, as can be seen from the following testimony:

St. Clement of Alexandria: "Christ gave birth to the Church in the agony of His flesh and He wrapped it in the swaddling clothes of His precious blood." in8

St. John Chrysostom: "And there gushed forth blood and water. And not without reason did these two fountains spring forth, because out of them the Church was constituted.''184

St. Augustine: "The second Adam, inclining His head, slept on the Cross in order that His spouse would be fashioned there, springing forth from the side of Him who slept." 188

St. Leo the Great: "So clearly was the transition then made from the synagogue to the Church that when the Lord gave up His soul, the veil of the Temple was rent." 166

St. Bonaventure: "In order that the Church might be fashioned from the rib of Christ as He slept on the Cross ... it was permitted by the divine disposition that one of the soldiers should pierce that sacred side with a lance.''187

In the hymn for First Vespers of the feast of the Sacred Heart, the Church sings in the liturgy:

"From opened Heart is bom the Church,
Tire bride of Christ, and in His side
Is placed the entrance to the Ark
To save the world from sin."

Truly, the Church is the mystical body of Christ, that is, the visible organism, vivified interiorly by the effusion of graces, gifts and charisms. By the redemption effected on the Cross, Christ established this mystical body, uniting men to Himself and forming a new mystical person, for through His condign satisfaction He reconciled them to the Father, He freed them from Satan's power and He won for Himself a chosen people. He had likewise gained for Himself an infinite treasury of graces, through which He was able to shower on men the fullness of the Holy Spirit. Thus, He was constituted Head of the mystical body, and the Church is "the mystical body of that divine Head.''108

It follows from the foregoing doctrine that the Blessed Virgin, associated with her Son, the Redeemer, also intervened in her own

way in the birth of the Church. St. Albert the Great states that during the Passion, when the Mother of mercy was united to the Father of mercies and bore the suffering of the Passion as the sword of sorrow pierced her heart, thus becoming a consort of Christ in the Passion and a cooperator in redemption and the Mother of the entire human race, she engendered us, not without pain, to eternal life in and through her Son.[100]

St. Antoninus says that just as Christ engendered us to the spiritual life of grace, which is much more perfect than natural life, by suffering on the Cross, so also Mary, by enduring tremendous sufferings for us in union with her Son, engendered us and gave birth to us amid great suffering.[170]

Pope Leo XIII affirms that as the Mother of Jesus Christ, the Blessed Virgin is also the Mother of all Christians, because she gave birth to them on Calvary during the supreme torments of the Redeemer.[171]

Tims, Christ and Mary achieved the same effect of redemption, but each in a different way, as we have already stated. Therefore, all that Christ did by satisfying and meriting condignly on the Cross to establish His mystical body, the Church, was also done in her way by Man· at the foot of the Cross. By suffering with Christ, she also made satisfaction and merited all the graces which would be poured forth on the Church. Thus, she is Mother of the Church and principal member of the mystical body of Christ.

t h e s i s: Between Pentecost and *her assumption, Mary assisted the Church by her teaching, counsel, prayers, example, protection and the tender consolation of her presence.*

After He arose glorious from the dead, Jesus lived on earth for forty days, appearing often to His apostles and speaking to them of the kingdom of God. According to a pious and probable opinion, recorded by Suârez, He appeared first to His Mother, and several times He gladdened her with His presence.[172]

After these days, Christ ascended into heaven from Mount Olivet, where His disciples and apostles had assembled (Acts 1:12), contemplating Him, and not they alone, but also the pious women, and especially Mary.[173]

Consoled by Christ's admirable ascension into heaven, Mary and

her companions, the apostles and the rest of the disciples, returned to Jerusalem, where they remained in the Cenacle, persevering in prayer (Acts 1:14) in order to prepare themselves to receive the Holy Spirit, whom Christ had promised. Pope Leo XIII says: "Nevertheless, for the fulfillment of the task of human redemption there remains still the coming of the Holy Ghost, as promised by Christ. And behold, Mary is in the room; there, praying with the apostles and entreating for them with sighs and tears, she hastens for the Church the coming of the Spirit, the Comforter, the supreme Gift of Christ, the Treasure that will never fail." 174

When the day of Pentecost finally arrived, they were all together in the Cenacle, and suddenly a sound came from heaven. It was as of a violent wind blowing, and it filled the whole house (Acts 2:1-2). And the Holy Spirit came upon them and filled each with a plenitude, depending on the capacity, dignity and devotion with which each was prepared. And since Mary was superior to all and the best disposed, she received the most abundant supernatural favors.

With this coming of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, Christ's Church, or the Kingdom of God on earth, of which Christ had so often spoken to His apostles during His forty days on earth, remained fully constituted in its formal existence: the mystical body of Christ. It is now that the Old Testament is abolished and the New inaugurated, as St. Cyril of Jerusalem teaches.170

Observing all that has been said, we shall now try to determine the help which Mary gave the infant Church from the day of Pentecost until the day of her glorious assumption into heaven. We find nothing in Sacred Scripture nor in the books of the early Fathers that would enable us to know what Mary did during this time. But in spite of this silence, we can and must believe that she used that time to perform her unique duties as Mother of the new-born Church.

Pope Leo XIII describes Mary's influence in the primitive Church as follows: "Though worthy of heaven, she abides a while on earth, so that the infant Church may be directed and comforted by her 'who penetrated, beyond all belief, into the deep secrets of divine wisdom.' "170

"With wonderful care she nurtured the first Christians by her holy example, her authoritative counsel, her sweet consolation, her fruitful prayers. She was, in very truth, the Mother of the Church, the

Teacher and Queen of the apostles, to whom, besides, she confided no small part of the divine mysteries which she kept in her heart." 177

St. George of Nicomedia exclaims: "Therefore I now proclaim her, not only your Mother, but the guide of the rest of the apostles, and I wish to honor her with the prerogative of Mother." 178

St. Amadeus of Lausanne states that Mary's stay in the world was no small consolation to the disciples of Christ. The Lord desired that after His return to the Father the apostles should enjoy her consolation and teaching, for although they were instructed by the Holy Ghost, they could still learn from her who had brought the Sun of justice into the world.17'

Using John, the Beloved Disciple, as a symbol of the Church, St. Lawrence Justinian describes the Church which was commended to the care of the Mother of Christ: "I leave her (the Church) to you (His Mother) in the person of this disciple. Love her as you love Me; encourage her with exhortations; strengthen her with counsel; teach her by example. . . . There must necessarily rise up against her (the Church) violent tempests, bitter persecutions and all kinds of heresy. Still weak in the faith, even less established in virtues and not accustomed to struggles, she will readily succumb or will not take up the sword against the enemy if she sees herself deprived of her Captain and Leader. I know that she must be disturbed because of My early and ignominious death. But with your teachings, she will rise, with your protection she will be fortified; and by your presence she will recover, if need be, her lost strength." 180

St. Peter Canisius says that Christ left Mary to the disciples as mother and teacher. Her sweet presence is a consolation in sadness, a light in teaching, strength in battle and a singular help in their first steps.181

Theological reasoning confirms this very point, since Mary is the Mother of the whole, the total Christ; not only of His physical body, but also of His mystical body, which is the Church. Therefore, if she nurtured and cared for Christ with regard to His physical body, omitting nothing whatever, she must also have done the same in regard to His mystical body, the Church, protecting and nurturing its newly born members.182

We shall now consider the manner in which the Blessed Virgin assisted the Church in particular, that is, by her teaching, counsel,

example and the consolation of her sweet presence. As regards her teaching, it will suffice to select a few testimonies from the Fathers and theologians. St. Ambrose implies with sufficient clarity that St. John received much of his doctrine from the Blessed Virgin: "She was commended to St. John the Evangelist, who was a virgin. Therefore, it does not surprise me that she would speak of the divine mysteries to him more than to the others." 188

St. Bernard says: "The conception effected in Elizabeth is announced to Mary because it was fitting that, since it would soon be known, she should learn this news from an angel rather than from a human being, so that the Mother of God would not appear to be ignorant of the plans of her Son. Moreover, it was fitting that she should be instructed concerning the coming of the Savior and the Precursor and should know the time and order of things so that she could better reveal the truth to the preachers and writers of the Gospel, having herself been fully instructed from the beginning concerning all the mysteries." 184

Eadmer states that in his opinion it was useful and necessary that the Blessed Virgin converse with the apostles after the Ascension, for although the revelation made by the Holy Spirit would teach them all things, Mary, through the operation of the same Holy Spirit, penetrated the truths more deeply and she also revealed to the apostles many things which she had learned by herself through her association with Christ.188

St. Luke narrates many facts about the events of Christ's life, such as the annunciation, the birth of Christ, the flight into Egypt, the presentation in the Temple, etc. But he was not present at any of these events and therefore he must have learned of them from others, as he testifies in the beginning of his Gospel: "Even as they who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word have handed them down to us." It follows that St. Luke must have received his information from the Blessed Virgin, since she was present at all of these events and in some instances she was the only one who could have known about them. As Knabenbauer points out, St. Luke twice mentions the fact that Mary preserved all these things in her heart (2:19-51), and since he states that he had received his information of these early events from those who were present to them, it must logically follow that Mary herself recounted the facts.18·

Nor should it be said that Mary's intervention was unnecessary in the teaching of the apostles because inspiration suffices and because the apostles, filled as they were with the Holy Spirit, would know whatever was necessary for preaching and teaching. It is true that inspiration suffices in those matters which God reveals directly, but it is in accordance with the divine plan that some *of* the material written under inspiration would concern natural facts and events which the apostles had learned from their own experience or had received from the testimony of others, and sometimes these others had themselves received the knowledge through revelation.[187] Moreover, although the apostles had been instructed by the Holy Spirit and were personally infallible,[188] it was not on this account unnecessary that they should approach the Blessed Virgin, who was much better instructed than they were in the divine mysteries. As Sinibaldi observes, in the Holy Spirit the apostles had an infallible teacher, but this magisterium did not dispense them from having recourse to other sources, the clearest and richest of which was the Blessed Virgin, especially in those matters touching the infancy and childhood of Jesus.[189]

As regards Mary's assistance to the Church through counseling, it is proper to counsel to resolve factual questions and to resolve what is to be done in difficult matters.[190] It is evident from many passages in the Acts of the Apostles that the apostles and the early Christians were beset with many grave problems. It is therefore logical to suppose that they would have had recourse to Mary, the Mother of God, because she would know what should be done in accordance with circumstances. Thus, the Congregation of Rites has declared: "Instructed by divine wisdom, she generously imparted to her neighbors the words of life which she had received from her Son and had preserved in her heart. Not only at the wedding of Cana in Galilee did the ministers approach this new Rebecca, but it can also be believed that the pious women and the other disciples of the Lord, including the apostles themselves, had her for their counselor."[191]

It is easy to understand how Mary would be an example and model to the newborn Church, for Christ left her as such so that the apostles and the other Christians could contemplate her *life and holy* manners and imitate her. As St. Ambrose says: "Her whole life was

a rule of discipline, a norm of virtues and a formula of utter probity."[194]

Christ likewise willed to leave His Mother on earth after His ascension so that in His absence she would be a source of consolation for the faithful. The reason for doing this is beautifully expressed by Guevara: "Since Christ had lived for some time on earth and had attracted the hearts of the faithful to Himself, thus winning their love, He did not wish to absent Himself from them suddenly and completely, lest, deprived totally of the presence of their Beloved, their wounded hearts would yield to despair. Therefore, He resolved to leave them for their consolation amidst sorrow the most perfect example of Himself and the image which represented Him most completely. And what creature could be most faithfully assimilated to His immense goodness than she who had lived with Him in the closest intimacy and had ardently tasted of the torrents of His gifts? Who could better substitute for His bodily presence than she whose likeness offered to the faithful the beauty of her Son? For Christ, as St. Ambrose says, resembled His Mother, and just as in Him shone forth the likeness of the paternal divinity, since He was the splendor of the Father (Heb. 1:3), so also there was manifest in His face the lines of the beauty of His Mother. Consequently, anyone who gazed upon His Mother would likewise see immediately the likeness of the Son." [198]

t h e s i s : *Mary's cooperation throughout the course of the centuries since her glorious assumption into heaven.*

The Church may be considered as an existing reality or as a powerful force. In the first sense it is a historical fact, remarkable for its admirable propagation, its internal unity and strength, though attacked by dissensions, schisms and heresies, and its external stability, by which it resists efficaciously and victoriously the attacks of its external enemies.

As a powerful force, the Church is manifested in the fruits which enable us to recognize its fecundity and life. The inexhaustible fruitfulness of the Church is revealed *qualitatively,* insofar as it produces fruits of every kind, and principally of eminent sanctity, and *quantitatively,* insofar as, through the almost infinite abundance of those

fruits, the Church never fades or grows old, but always flourishes and renews all who receive of its fruit of eternal salvation.

However, this division of the Church must not be understood in too absolute a sense, as if the two aspects were mutually exclusive. Rather, it must be understood in a broader sense, since the propagation, unity and stability of the Church must be counted among the more eminent fruits by those who recognize its true unfading life."[4]

Under all of those aspects, Mary has helped, encouraged and wondrously defended the Church in the course of the centuries. With regard to her assistance in the spread of the Church, we quote the words of Pope Leo XIII: "It is no exaggeration to say that it is due chiefly to her leadership and help that the wisdom and teachings of the Gospel spread so rapidly to all nations of the world, in spite of the most obstinate difficulties and most cruel persecutions, and brought everywhere in their train a new reign of justice and peace. "[5]

No less significant are the words of St. Cyril of Alexandria: "Through you the apostles have preached salvation to the nations - - - ; through you the priceless Cross is everywhere honored and venerated; through you the demons have been put to rout and mankind has been summoned back to heaven; through you every misguided creature held in the thrall of idols is led to recognize the truth; through you have the faithful been brought to the laver of holy baptism and churches have been founded among every people. "

Alcazar states that from the beginning of the Church, Mary was a refuge and most secure help and that this assistance did not cease at her assumption, but still continues from heaven. Indeed, the various successes of the Church in conversions of nations are due in no small measure to Mary's help.[107] Hence, the Pius Union of tire Clergy for the Missions venerates Mary as its patroness and places under her special patronage the goal that is sought.[108] And so it is that the Blessed Virgin bums with the most fervent zeal for the spread of the Church. As consort of Christ the Redeemer, she cannot but desire anxiously that the fruit of the passion and blood of her Son and of her own maternal compassion be extended more and more among pagan people, thus attaining the desired end of the conversion and salvation of tire infidels.

As regards the defense of orthodoxy and the extirpation of heresy, Pope Leo XIII speaks of Mary's help in giving strength to the faith:

"It has been her unremitting concern to see to it that the Catholic faith stands firmly lodged in the midst of the people, there to thrive in its fertile and undivided unity." .[B®]

Likewise, the Fathers celebrate and praise Mary as custodian of the Catholic faith. St. Cyril of Alexandria calls her "sceptre of the orthodox faith";[200] St. Germanus of Constantinople greets her, saying: "Hail, thou fountain which gushes forth by God's design, whose rivers overflow in pure and unsullied waves of orthodoxy and put to flight the hosts of error."[201] The sacred liturgy also chants: "Hail, voice of the apostles forever eloquent, solid foundation of the faith, unshakable support of the Church." [202] "Rejoice, because thou alone hast destroyed all the heresies in the world."[203]

Truly, Mary has always been a shield and defense of the Catholic faith, not only by reason of her divine maternity and the wonderful prerogatives with which she was adorned, especially her immaculate conception, which is a kind of summary of Christian revelation, but because she desires and obtains that the faithful persevere in the unity of the faith of Christ.[204]

The Church is the mystical body of Christ, not separated, disordered and confused, but harmonious, united and well organized. The organization and order consist not only in constantly preserving the same doctrine of faith, but in holding and respecting a rule and principle of unity which insures common agreement in the doctrine of faith, namely, the authority of the Roman Pontiff, visible Vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter, Prince of the apostles, to whom God entrusted the care of His sheep. But it is proper to Mary, as Mother of the Church, to see that the body of the Church lives rightly ordered and that the entire Christian family senses that it is totally united in the unity of the Catholic faith.

Regarding Mary's assistance in fomenting the unity of the Church and the return of the dissident brethren to the bosom of Holy Mother the Church, Pope Leo XIII exhorts all Catholics to direct their petitions to Mary.

As the nascent Church rightly joined itself in prayer with her as the patroness and most excellent custodian of unity, so in these times it is most opportune to do the same all over the Catholic world.[203] Trust Mary, implore her aid. That the one selfsame profession of faith may unite the minds of Christian nations in peace and harmony.

that the one and only bond of perfect charity may gather their hearts within its embrace—such is our prayerful hope! And may Mary, by her powerful help, bring this ardently desired gift into our possession! And remembering that her only-begotten Son prayed so earnestly to His heavenly Father for the closest union among the nations whom He has called by the one baptism to the one inheritance of salvation, bought for an infinite price, will she not, for that reason, see to it that all in His marvelous light will strive as with one mind for unity? And will it not be her wish to employ her goodness and providence to console the spouse of Christ, the Church, through her long-sustained efforts in this enterprise, as well as to bring to full perfection the boon of unity among the members of the Christian family, which is the illustrious fruit of her motherhood?[204]

Pope Pius XI teaches the same doctrine.

Therefore, let us invoke this most benign Mother, principally under this title *(Regina pascuorum),* so that the dissident brethren will return to the salutary pasture where Peter, living always in his successors, and Vicar of the eternal Shepherd, feeds and guides all the sheep and lambs in the Christian fold.[202]

May God our Savior, who desires to save all the men and lead them to the knowledge of the truth, heed our fervent supplications and deign to call to the unity of the Church all who have strayed. In which grave matter We wish to use and We desire that there be used the prayers of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of divine grace, Conqueror of all heresies and Help of Christians, so that she will obtain for us as soon as possible the advent of that desired day in which all men will hear the voice of her divine Son, striving for and preserving the unity of the Spirit in the embrace of peace.[203]

But We desire especially, under the auspices of the heavenly Queen, that all should beg *for* a very special favor of the greatest consequence, namely, that she who is so ardently loved and venerated by the dissident churches of the East, may not permit that they should be unhappily living as separated brethren nor that they should still remain apart from the unity of the Church, and thus from her Son, whose Vicar on earth We are.[209]

St. Cermanus of Constantinople directs this supplication to Mary: "Be mindful of the Christians, who are thy servants; second their prayers, nourish their hope, strengthen their faith and gather them together in one Church."[210]

Truly, Mary is Mother of the Church, that is, of the human family gathered together in one body, the body of Christ which is the Church, of which St. Cyprian says: "He who abandons it, has neither salvation nor life."[2,1] It is proper to the Mother to see to it that all those who erroneously depart from this unity and abandon the sanctuary of the family should return to share once more in the goods and life of the paternal home.

In regard to the inexhaustible fecundity of the Church, in which spiritual fruits of all kinds abound and especially that of sanctity, Mary gives a noteworthy assistance in every age. The Church is the mother of sanctity, whose abundance is shown in the fruits of sanctification it produces and in the children it has led to sanctity. The Church was established by Christ under holy laws and given the means for fostering virtue, but it has produced and still produces saints. It pertains to Mary, as Mother of the Church, to nurture these children so that they will reach the measure of the fullness of Christ and bear fruit in all holiness. With good reason is the Church presented as the garden of Mary, which she herself irrigates and makes fertile by abundant showers of heavenly graces, in order to produce fruits of eminent sanctity.[212]

Corollary. Since Mary's help and protection in behalf of the Church has been so excellent through all the ages, it is clear that she should be invoked with unlimited confidence in difficult moments, anxieties, necessities and in time of persecution. Therefore, Pope Pius XI exhorts: "If the Church falls on difficult times; if faith wanes and charity grows cold; if morals, private and public, deteriorate; if any danger threatens the Catholic cause or civil society, let us have recourse to her, begging help from heaven.

"With more ardent effort, therefore, in the present needs under which we labor, let all go to her, and with supplication beg earnestly that, by interceding with her Son, the erring nations may return to Christian principles and precepts, on which the foundation of public welfare rests, and through which desirable peace and true happiness flourish in abundance."[218]

CHAPTER FOUR

Titles Derived from JWary's Cooperation

*

There are five principle titles and offices due Mary, the Mother of God, by reason of her cooperation in redemption: Mediatrix, Co-redemptrix, Mother of Christians, Patroness or Advocate, and Queen and Mistress of the universe.

Mediatrix

The word mediator signifies a person who intervenes between two other persons in order to unite and reconcile them in some way. There are two elements to consider in the notion of a mediator: the notion of the mean or medium between two extremes, and the office or act by which the mean or medium is established between the two extremes.' Hence, he is called a mediator who performs this function of bringing together what has been separated. St. Thomas says: "We may consider two things in a mediator: first, that he is a mean; secondly, that he unites others. Now it is of the nature of a mean to be distant from each extreme, while it unites by communicating to one that which belongs to the other." 2

Following this doctrine, theologians usually distinguish a twofold mediation: *ontological* and *moral.* In the first, the mediator must have something in common with those for whom he mediates. He must be united to them and at the same time be separate from them in some way. This separation is to be understood not only in a physical sense, but also with regard to the dispute existing between them. A man can be a true mediator between contenders as long as he does not enter the dispute or disagreement.8

The second mediation, moral mediation, refers to the act of reconciling the two dissident parties. In order to effect the reconciliation, two methods may be used: i) when the mediator unites the litigants by meriting for them and helping them by his own works; 2) when he unites them by interceding or supplicating to one for the other.

That Christ our Lord is the Mediator, is clearly attested by the Apostle (I Tim. 2:5) saying: "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus." Christ is Mediator in the ontological order, because He has something in common with those between whom He mediates, God and men, *for He* has both a divine and a human nature. "He is the Mediator between God and man," says St. Augustine, "because He is God with the Father, and a man with men. A mere man could not be a mediator between God and man; nor could a mere God. Behold the Mediator." 4 St. Irenaeus states that it was fitting that the mediator between God and man should bring the two parties to concord through His identification with each party.8

That Christ is Mediator in the moral order is stated by St. Paul (II Cor. 5:18-19): "But all things are from God, who has reconciled us to Himself through Christ and has given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For God was truly in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself by not reckoning against men their sins and by entrusting to us the message of reconciliation." And in his Epistle to the Ephesians (2:14-16) he states: "For He Himself is our peace, He it is who has made both one, and has broken down the intervening wall of the enclosure, the enmity', in His flesh . . . , and reconciled both in one body to God by the Cross, having slain the enmity in Himself."

There arc two heretical opinions concerning the nature of Christ in relation to His role as Mediator. Francis Stancarus maintained that Christ was our Mediator only by reason of His human nature, for *if He is* considered as God, He is one with the Father and cannot suffer nor die nor discharge any office as a mediator. In opposition to this error, many Protestants, such as Melanchthon, Wigand and Calvin, went to the opposite extreme and taught that Christ in His divine nature alone, is and always was, even before the Incarnation, our sole Mediator.

Catholic doctrine, condemning both heretical opinions, maintains that Christ is our Mediator as man, not precisely in His human na-

hire, but so far as this human nature is united hypostatically to the divine Person, His human nature is the *principium quo* of mediatorial operations; the divine Person is the *principium quod* of those operations, and gives them an infinite value.

According to Satolli, Catholic doctrine distinguishes between the substance of the mediator and the exercise of the office of mediator. In the true Mediator, Christ, we find two natures; in the exercise of the work of mediator, we again distinguish between the external work and the efficacy or dignity from which value and merit flow. The external work of mediation pertains to the nature of man in Christ or to His person so far as He is human (e.g., to suffer and to make satisfaction), but the efficacy proceeds from the divine Person subsistent in the human nature.®

This principal office of mediator, which consists in the reconciliation of the dissidents, was fulfilled by Christ by means of His satisfactions and merits and consummated by His death on the altar of the Cross. Hence, St. Paul (Col. 1:19-20) says: "For it has pleased God the Father that in Him all His fullness should dwell, and that through Him He should reconcile to Himself all things, whether on the earth or in the heavens, making peace through the blood of His cross."

The fruits of this mediatorial function have been most remarkable. By satisfying and meriting for us to the shedding of His blood on the cross, Christ made God propitious to us and gained for us an infinite treasure of graces. At the same time. He restored the bond of friendship between God and men, and obtained for us remission of our sins and of eternal punishment, although He did not will to free us of the penalties we are to suffer in this vale of tears, but left them for us as a test and a crown. He anointed them with His blood, which tempers all bitterness.

Christ's mediation did not end at His death or His glorious resurrection, but it continues in heaven, communicating to us the sanctifying fruits of His passion. St. Paul says: "He lives always to make intercession for us" (Heb. 7:25).

Because of this unceasing prayer to the Father on our behalf, Christ, as man, is the principal moral cause of our sanctification and salvation; to which should be added, in the opinion of many theo-

logians, the physical instrumental concursus of His sacred humanity with respect to all the effects of grace.

Presupposing this doctrine of Christ as Mediator, we can easily pass on to the study of Mary's mediation, whose archetype and model is the mediation of Christ.

t h e s i s: Mary *is truly mediatrix of the human race and this doctrine pertains to the deposit of faith.*

Previous Observations. We have shown that there is a twofold mediation in Christ: ontological and moral. It is certain that an ontological mediation befits Mary, since she is united to men and belongs by her very nature to the human family. Moreover, she touches the confines of the Divinity by reason of her divine maternity, by which relationship with God she possesses eminent gifts that elevate her above all creatures and separate her entirely from sinners. The human race had incurred the guilt of sin and needed reconciliation, but Mary, preserved from original sin from the first moment of her immaculate conception by the future merits of Christ, and thus redeemed in a most sublime way, was not drawn from the "mass of sin" but was preserved from incurring sin and was thus separated from the rest of men who at birth are "children of wrath" (Eph.

The question is principally one of moral mediation; that is, the office of uniting and reconciling God with men. It should be noted that it is not only a question of Mary's *remote* mediation in the reconciliation of men with God through her divine motherhood, by which she produced the universal Mediator of men, but also of her *immediate* and *personal intervention by* reason of her intimate association with Christ the Mediator.

Errors. The Protestants generally attack and reject the title of mediatrix by which the Church honors Mary, as *if* this were an offense to Christ, the only Mediator between God and men. The Anglican Congress of 1897 warned its members against exalting the Virgin Mary to the point of making her a mediatrix in place of Christ.§ The title of mediatrix has also been rejected by the Jansenists, Muratori and Fischer.®

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Pius IX says: "With her only-

begotten Son, Mat}' is the most powerful mediatrix and conciliatrix in the whole world." 10

Pope Leo XIII: "How rightly, too, has every nation and every liturgy' without exception acclaimed her great renown, which has grown greater with the voice of each succeeding century. Among her many other titles we find her hailed as 'our Lady, our mediatrix.' " "

Pope Pius XI: "Being the unique Mediator between God and men, Christ desired that His Mother be united to Him as advocate of sinners and mediatrix and dispenser of grace." 12

The same Pontiff exhorts the faithful that on the day dedicated to the Sacred Heart, they should raise their petitions to the Sacred Heart and at the same time call upon the all-powerful intercession of the Virgin Mother of God, mediatrix of all graces.13

Fathers and Theologians. The writings of the Fathers and Theologians touching on this matter are of two types: in some of them there is explicit reference to Mary as mediatrix, and in others there are equivalent expressions referring to her mediation. Of those who use the word "mediatrix" explicitly, we may mention St. Ephrcm, St. Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom, Basil of Selcucia, St. Andrew of Crete, St. Germanus of Constantinople, St. John Damascene, St. Theodore, St. Antoninus and Denis the Carthusian.14

Many of the Fathers and writers do not expressly give Mary the title of mediatrix, but profess and praise her mediation by words which signify this title. The notion of mediation is easily found in the comparison between Eve and Mary, the new Eve, who was the consort in redemption as the former was a partner in the fall. It can likewise be seen in references to Mary's spiritual motherhood of men and her role as advocate of sinners. Not only is Mary's remote and physical mediation referred to, so far as she engendered Christ, our Mediator, but also her immediate and personal intervention in obtaining man's reconciliation with God. The very name mediatrix presupposes a moral and direct action, and the expressions used in these documents leave no doubt that the writers are referring to a moral mediation. This is even more evident in the references to Mary's intervention in heaven.15

The Liturgy. Tire Eastern liturgy salutes Mary as "heavenly ladder," "mediatrix who is not confounded," "our only help." 10

The Roman liturgy celebrates the feast of Mary, Mediatrix of all

graces, with the following prayer: "Lord Jesus Christ, our Mediator with the Father, who didst deign to make Thy Blessed Virgin Mother our own Mother also, and mediatrix between Thyself and us."

Theological Argument. The mediator, in conformity with what the word signifies, i.e., to be the mean and to exercise the office of uniting the extremes, requires two conditions, of which the first is to be removed from both extremes, and the second is to bring to each of them something of the other. Now, Mary is separate from God by her nature and condition as a creature, and from men by her dignity as the Mother of God, the fullness of grace with which she is enriched, and the singular gift of her immaculate conception. At the same time, she brings to men the gifts of God and to God the satisfaction, merit, supplication and glorification of men, not as received from men, but because she herself offers them to God in their name. She is, therefore, a true mediatrix between God and men.

On the other hand, this title of mediatrix does not lessen Christ's mediation nor obscure it in any way, since Mary is not the mediatrix in the same sense as Christ is Mediator between God and men. Mary's mediation is not of the same order as is that of Christ, but of another kind, and always dependent on His, from which hen receives all its efficacy.

Moreover, this ministry of Mary, the Mother, redounds to the honor of her Son, for it manifests the opulence of Christ the Mediator who, without any detraction from His own mediation, enriched His Mother with so exalted a ministry. In like manner, God's creatures manifest, not the indigence, but the abundance of divine power by exercising the activity they have from God and subjecting themselves to Him in their operations.

t h e s i s: *By what actions Mary exercised and now exercises her office of mediatrix.*

Since Mary is the consort of Christ the Mediator, we must not judge her activity as mediatrix in a manner different from that of Christ. And since Christ effects His mediation by the same operations with which He effected redemption, it is evident that the former resolves itself into objective mediation, by which Christ satisfied to God condignly by shedding His blood on the Cross, reconciling us to God, making Himself a propitiation for us and meriting for us an

infinite treasure of graces, and subjective mediation, by which the fruits of redemption are distributed and applied to men, with Christ Himself interceding in our behalf through the physical concursus of His sacred humanity. Objective mediation was consummated on the altar of the Cross when Christ said: "It is consummated" (John 19:30); subjective mediation is continued in heaven, where Christ lives always to make intercession for us (Heb. 7:25).

In like manner, Mary, associated with the Redeemer, discharges her office of mediatrix by cooperating with Him both in the work of objective mediation and in the application of its fruits, which is subjective mediation. Hence Marian mediation comprises two functions: remote cooperation, by giving Christ a body so that He could pay the price of human redemption, and *proximate* cooperation by her personal actions, principally by her motherly compassion, by which, united to Christ and subordinate to Him, she satisfied with Him to God and merited all the graces of salvation. The second concerns the application of the fruits of redemption or the distribution of graces, obtaining them from God by her most powerful intercession and dispensing them to men.

Of these two mediatorial functions of the Blessed Virgin, she accomplished the first while on earth, for that was the only state in which she could co-satisfy and co-merit. The second, she exercises principally in heaven, where she unceasingly performs the office of advocate in the work of our salvation. By this double title Mary fully deserves the name of mediatrix, although ordinarily, by reason of her mediatorial function in the distribution of graces which she continuously exercises in heaven, she is called mediatrix of all graces, under which title she is honored by the feast which is celebrated on May 31.

Corollary. From tire foregoing it is evident that Mary should be given the title of mediatrix. However, three different formulas may be used to express it. She may be called simply mediatrix, without any other addition, mediatrix between God and men, or mediatrix between Christ and men. We shall explain the sense of the last two formulas.

Both formulas mean the same in an identical or *material* sense for Christ is God, and to say that Mary is the mediatrix between Christ and men is to say that she is mediatrix between God and men. But considered *formally,* they possess a different sense. In one the

position and office of the Blessed Virgin is established between Cod the Father and us, while in the other, she is placed between Christ, her Son, and men. Therefore, in her title as mediatrix between God and men, Mary is considered as mediatrix *with* Christ (but subordinate to Him), and in this is included her quality as consort of the Redeemer. In her title as mediatrix between Christ and men, she is considered, not as mediating *with* Christ, but rather *near* Christ, as *Mother of the Redeemer* and of the *redeemed,* whom she considers lovingly as brothers of her Firstborn (Rom. 8:29).

The first of those two titles must be preferred to the second in objective mediation, in which Christ, subsistent in His human nature by actions proper to it, and with Mary cooperating in her manner, made satisfaction to Himself as God no less than to the Father and the Holy Spirit, who are one and the same God (although accepting satisfaction is attributed by appropriation to the Father). The other title should be preferred in subjective mediation, by which, through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, Christ, sacrificed on the Cross, "became to all who obey Him the cause of eternal salvation" (Heb. 5:9), distributing the riches of redemption among men.

t h e s i s : *Whether, besides Christ and Mary, others can be called mediators.*

It is certain that, outside of Christ and Mary, no one can be a mediator in the task of reconciling God and men by cooperating in objective redemption, by which an offended God is appeased and graces are merited for man's return to God's friendship. But besides Christ, the perfect Mediator, and Mary, others can be called mediators insofar as they concur in the distribution of redemptive graces to men through their merits, prayers, ministerial power or any other way. Thus, the blessed in heaven, the just on earth, and priests generally, cooperate in this way in the reconciliation of men with God, since they are truly capable of mediating. They are united to God, cither through the beatific vision, sanctifying grace, or the gift of a supernatural power, and they are united to men through benevolence, mercy or ministerial duties.

Nevertheless, this mediation presupposes that of Christ and of Mary, from whose power theirs is derived and without which theirs could not exist. Thus, St. Thomas says: "Christ alone is the perfect

Mediator of God and men, inasmuch as, by His death, He reconciled the human race to God. Hence the Apostle, after saying, 'Mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus,' added: 'who gave Himself a redemption for all.' However, nothing prevents certain others from being called mediators, in some respect, between God and man, inasmuch as they cooperate in uniting men to God, dispositively or ministerially.''[17]

thesis: *The excellence of Marian mediation in relation to that of Christ and the rest of the saints.*

Christ alone is the primary, principal and supreme Mediator; Mary is a subordinate and secondary mediator. Christ is a Mediator sufficient of Himself, who needs help from no one, and is absolutely necessary for redeeming men by condign satisfaction. Mary is a mediator hypothetically, inasmuch as God, by the decree of His most free will, deigned to associate her with Christ in the work of redemption.

Christ is the universal Mediator, even of Mary, who needed redemption, and was actually redeemed in a more sublime manner than were the rest of men. She cannot be mediatrix for herself; she is so only in regard to others. But, Mary's mediation exceeds and surpasses that of the other saints to an extraordinary degree because she exercised her mediation in objective redemption from beginning to end on Calvary, something no other saint could do. Moreover, Mary intervenes in subjective redemption much more efficaciously and universally than do all the other servants of God. We shall speak later of Mary's pre-eminent position over the saints.

Co-Redcmptrix

The title of co-redemptrix is closely united to that of mediatrix and is actually included in it as a part in the whole. Christ is the Redeemer of the human race, as the Apostle says: "Who gave Himself a ransom for all" (I Tim. 2:6); and in Galatians: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, becoming a curse for us" (3:13). On which St. Augustine comments by saying that the Redeemer came and payed the price; He shed His blood and purchased the whole

world." And the sacred liturgy sings: "O happy fault, which deserved to have so great and glorious a Redcemerl" With this in view, we shall discuss whether the title of co-redemptrix belongs to the Virgin Mother of God, Christ's consort in the work of redemption, and by what kind of acts.

thesis: *Mary is rightly called co-redemptrix of the human race.*

Opinions, lire Protestants and Jansenists reject the title of co-redemptrix, as does Muratori, who maintains that Mary had no part in the work of redemption.[18]

Some theologians, such as Pohle, Billot and Rivière, do not use this title, because, they say, redemption was effected by Christ alone.[20] Others, like Scheeben [21] and Schütz, recommended that for reasons of prudence, this title ought not be used. Bartmann does not differ much from this opinion, for he judges that it should not be used without some clarification.[22]

The Roman Pontiffs and Sacred Congregations. Pope Leo XIII summed up this doctrine by stating that Mary was associated with Jesus in the work of human redemption. Pope Benedict XV said that she suffered almost to death in union with her Son's passion and death, so that it can be said that with Christ, she redeemed the world. Pope Pius XI not only states that she suffered with Christ, but that by her compassion and co-redemption she assisted her Son when He effected man's redemption on the altar of the Cross.[23]

The Sacred Congregation of Rites used this title explicitly, calling Mary the most merciful co-redemptrix of the human race.[21] On June 26, 1913, the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office commended as praiseworthy the custom *of* adding to the name of Jesus that of Mary, our co-redemptrix. In January of 1914, the same Holy Office attached an indulgence to a prayer in which Mary is specifically praised as co-redemptrix of the human race.

Fathers and Theologians. The Fathers of the Church and theologians usually salute Mary by the title of co-redemptrix in equivalent terms. Thus, St. Ephrem speaks of her as "the redemption of my sins," and John Geometer refers to her as "redemption from slavery."[ss] St. Germanus of Constantinople exclaims: "No one is saved except through thee; no one is redeemed except through thee, O Mother of Godl" [20] St. John Damascene states that through Mary

wc have all been redeemed from damnation, and Alenin says that all the world rejoices because it was redeemed through Mary.27 And George of Rhodes states that Mary can be called redemptrix of men in a true and proper sense, although in a less principal and less proper sense than the term Redeemer is applied to Christ.28

Mary is also referred to as helper or cooperator in the work of salvation and redemption. Thus, George of Nicomedia refers to her as the cooperator in our salvation; St. Albert the Great says that since she was a consort in the Passion, she is also a helper in redemption; and St. Peter Damian states that we arc debtors of the Blessed Virgin and are indebted to her, after Christ, for the redemption of the human race.29

Lastly, Mary is hailed as restorer and reparatrix of the world and as savior of the world. St. Bernard refers to her as mediatrix of salvation and restorer of the world; Peter Blcscnse says that she has been constituted Lady of the universe and restorer of the world and the destroyer of hell; Denis the Carthusian states that he does not think that Mary cooperated with Christ the Savior as if He alone were not sufficient, but for many reasons Mary can be called cooperator of Christ and savior of the world.30

"Tire foregoing testimonies, and many others which could be offered," says Bovcr, "are sufficient indication of the great part which Mary had in human redemption and for this reason she can truly be called co-redemptrix." 81

As regards the word "co-redemptrix," it has been opposed by some because of its novelty, as if that were sufficient reason to deny it to Mary. It seems that Vega was the first to use the word in Spain in the thirteenth century,32 but it does not seem that he was the first ever to use the title, for it was used previously by Salmcrôn, when he stated that Mary received from Christ, although He did not need her works, the role of co-redemptrix, and this was to the greater glory of Christ.88 Πιο expression was also used by Van Ketwigh, who says that Mary can be called cooperator or co-redemptrix in human redemption in an orthodox sense.8·

However, in the Eastern Church Mary was praised much earlier with the title of co-redemptrix, as can be seen in tire collection of Armenian hymns called the *Sharakan.*™ On the other hand, those who reject the word "co-redemptrix" because it seems too novel,

should bear in mind the answer given by St. Athanasius to Arius concerning the use of the term "consubstantial": "Does the novelty of the word offend you or is it that you likewise reject the truth of the matter which is given this name? It is, indeed, an ancient truth which has received a new name, and not something which we accept as true because of the name." 88

Testimony of Catholic Bishops. In his exhortation to the priests assembled at the Basilica at Lourdes on April 26, 1935, Cardinal Paccllli (Pope Pius XII) referred to the Christian faithful from all over the world, raising their hands in supplication to the Redeemer and to His most holy Mother and co-redemptrix. Cardinal Gasquet, at the inaugural session of the Marian Congress celebrated in Rome in 1924, also referred to Mary as co-redemptrix and mediatrix. Cardinal Lepicier stated that the title of mediatrix contains all the grandeur of our heavenly Mother and is the most honorable title that could be given to her. He further states that the title has the sanction of so many centuries, without any opposition from the Church, that it could reasonably be said to be temerarious for anyone to doubt its lawful use.37

Similar testimony can be found in the sermon preached by Cardinal Lega at Frascati on February 8, 1931, the allocution of Cardinal Pignatelli before the Holy Father and the College *of* Cardinals on December 24, 1934, tbe sermon of Cardinal Minoretti on September 20, 1937, antl ^e sermon by Cardinal Schuster of Milan on the feast of the Seven Dolors.

His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster declared: "In carrying out the great work of Redemption, the chief solace and companion of Jesus was to be Mary. . . . From the first moment she had been in closer sympathy with Him than all the angels and saints put together . . . She was nearer Him during His passion and in her proper place by the side of the Divine Priest as He offered the Divine Victim upon the altar of the Cross. Through her knowledge of the Priest and His intentions, through her love and sympathy—the greatest possible—for Her divine Son, through the close association and conjunction of her soul with His in the work of redemption, she has obtained the singular and unique title of co-redemptrix."88

Cardinal Mercier: "At the hour that her Son expires, she is there.

at the foot of the gibbet on which her Son is crucified; she is bent down, like the priest at the altar. Iler Son offers Himself to the God of justice and mercy for the salvation of the world; Mary offers Him to God in the same spirit. . . . He is their Redeemer; she is their co-redemptrix.''39

Cardinal Van Roey: "At the instant that Mary pronounces her *fiat* and gives her consent to the incarnation, the divine mercy, at the same time that it infinitely abases the Son of God in making Him assume human nature, exalts human nature, in the person of Mary, to the confines of divinity, for Mary gives human nature to the Word. From that moment until Calvary, where she bends down under the Cross, she is intimately associated with every work of the Savior; she shares with Him the atrocious agonies of her Son and, with Him, she offers those sufferings to the Father for the salvation of the human race. By reason of her role as Mother of God and by her effective participation in the work of redemption, she has acquired full right to the title of co-redemptrix and spiritual Mother of all men."40

It would be impossible to cite all the passages in sermons and writings in which the Catholic hierarchy has proclaimed Mary as co-redemptrix. Those that we have mentioned should suffice, however, to give evidence of the sentiments of the Catholic prelates throughout tire world.

Teaching of Theologians. It is safe to say that theologians throughout the world now unanimously accept the title of co-redemptrix as properly belonging to Mary'. Here again, the list of theologians is far too extensive to mention. Those who are interested in the names or the works of such theologians may find them in the article by Bover, published in *Gregorianum,* or in any complete bibliography of Marian literature.41

Theological Argument. Co-redemptrix signifies cooperation, association or partnership with Christ the Redeemer in the work of human redemption. That is the precise meaning of the words having the prefix co and applied to Mary; for example, *compati Christo,* to suffer with Christ; *commori cum Christo,* to die with Christ, and so forth. These words signify a participation or a partnership on the part of Mary in tire actions and sufferings of Christ. Therefore, Mary- is truly a co-redemptrix because she cooperated with Christ in'the work of human redemption.

Nor does the title of co-redemptrix lessen the dignity of Christ the Redeemer, since it does not necessarily mean that the Blessed Virgin had to take an active part in redemption in the same way and to the same degree as Christ did, but it signifies a cooperation which is inferior, subordinate and less principal. In this sense the title can be used and applied to Mary in an orthodox sense.

thesis: *The acts by which Mary performed her office of co-redemptrix.*

Redemption, as has already been said, can be taken in two senses. In a wide sense, redemption comprises all that Christ accomplished in His mortal life in order to free us from sin and, once reconciled to God, to restore us to the supernatural life. In a strict sense, it can be considered under certain special or distinct aspects which are found in the redemptive work, and thus it possesses the characteristics of satisfaction, of merit, of sacrifice and of redemption strictly speaking.

Moreover, redemption is divided into objective and subjective. Objective redemption consists in the works *of* Christ, consummated in His passion and death, by which He made satisfaction for us, reconciled us to God and merited graces *for* us. Subjective redemption consists in distributing and applying to each man the fruits *of* divine redemption.

Christ is Redeemer, strictly speaking, through objective redemption, in conformity with what St. Peter says: "You know that you were redeemed from the vain manner of life handed down from your fathers, not with perishable things, with silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot" (I Pet. 1:18-19). St. Paul says: "For by one offering He has perfected forever those who are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14). St. John says: "Worthy art Thou to take the scroll and to open its seals, for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us for God with Thy blood" (Apoc. 5:9-10), for after the redemption consummated on the Cross by Christ's death, there remains only the application of its fruits.

By subjective redemption, Christ is our Advocate, as stated in the first Epistle of St. John (2:1-2): "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just; and He is a propitiation for our sins, not for ours only but also for those of the whole world"; and in St. Paul

(Hcb. 7:25): "Therefore He is able at all times to save those who come to God through Him, since He lives always to make intercession for them."

Both offices of Redeemer and Advocate constitute Christ as Mediator, and thus St. Paul says: "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all" (I Tim. 2:5-6), and in Hebrews (7:25), as quoted above, of which St. Augustine says: "Why does He make intercession for us? Because He deigned to be Mediator."[42]

Valencia distinguishes a twofold degree of reconciliation and teaches that Christ obtained it for us completely, although each degree in a distinct way: the first, in such a way that all men attain it without any mediation whatever, by the very fact that Christ suffered once for all; and the second (that is, the application of the power of the passion of Christ), in such a way that men could not attain it except under certain conditions which arc necessary in addition to the Passion. He then states that Christ is not a mediator in the same way now as He was in His passion and death and before His ascension. Then He fulfilled the office of mediator most perfectly and secured reconciliation for us. This He did only once by one single oblation. Nevertheless, Christ continues to perform the work of a mediator even now, because by interceding for us in heaven, He obtains for us the second degree of reconciliation.[43]

Now, in conformity to the concept of the Redeemer, wc must determine the concept of the co-redemptrix. Just as Christ is Redeemer by objective redemption, and Advocate by subjective redemption, and by both offices is constituted Mediator, so likewise the Blessed Virgin is co-redemptrix in virtue of her cooperation in objective redemption, she is advocate and dispenser of all graces through her cooperation in subjective redemption, and from this twofold cooperation results the office of mediatrix in its two stages, namely, co-redemption on earth and intercession now in heaven. Therefore, the reality demonstrated by the title of co-redemptrix is that of her cooperation with Christ the Redeemer in objective redemption, or in the work of human redemption—*remotely,* by giving Christ the body with which He might pay the price of our ransom, and *proximately* by suffering with her beloved Son as He died on the Cross. Hence St. Albert the Great could say: "As we are all under great obligation

to Jesus for His passion endured for love of us, so also are we under great obligation to Mary for the martyrdom which she voluntarily suffered for our salvation in the death of her Son."[44] And this is sufficient reason for calling Mary co-redemptrix.[45]

Mary's cooperation in the work of redemption, as we have demonstrated previously, bore all the particular aspects or marks of Christ's redemption, that is, of satisfaction, merit, sacrifice and redemption strictly speaking. And so it is that Mary, subordinate to Christ and united to Him who satisfied to God condignly, meriting all graces, offering Himself as a victim on the altar of the Cross and paying the price of human redemption, co-satisfied, co-merited and co-offered in her own way the sacrifice *of* the Cross. And thus she co-redeemed mankind by offering to God her beloved Son and her own sorrows as the price for our salvation.[46]

t h e s i s: *Whether others besides Mary can be called co-redeemers.*

Cardinal Lepicier does not hesitate to affirm that in addition to the Blessed Virgin as co-redemptrix, there are other co-redeemers, inasmuch as the abundant sufferings of the saints are also, in a certain way, redemptions, and when applied to us, they help us to pay the debt of atonement.[47] De la Taille also admits that others are co-redeemers when he says that Mary "is co-redemptrix through the sacrifice of the Redeemer, to which oblation she, like ourselves, but to a much more excellent degree, is united and associated through the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ which the Church offers."[48]

Smith follows the same opinion, but he attributes to Mary as co-rcdemptrix a co-rcdemptive activity of the same order as ours but of a much higher degree than that which pertains to the other members of the mystical body.[49]

But the negative answer is to be preferred, because the title of co-redemptrix or co-redeemer indicates an active cooperation in objective redemption. But no creature except the Blessed Virgin can possess this title because no one else participated in this way in the redemption of the human race.

Moreover, the principal effect of objective redemption consists in the abolition of the decree of condemnation and man's reconciliation with God and his restoration to divine friendship. But no one, how-

ever holy, can contribute to this effect. As St. Augustine says, "Anyone can imitate Christ by dying, but no one can imitate Him by redeeming." [110] St. Leo the Great says that although the death of the saints is precious in the sight of the Lord, the death of the innocent has never been a propitiation for the world.[51]

Nevertheless, nothing prevents the saints from being called mediators *secundum quid, so far* as they intercede for us and obtain graces for us, or so far as they can mitigate the temporal punishment due to our sins by applying their sufferings to us. But this always presupposes the redemption effected by Christ, with the cooperation of His Mother. Even more, what the saints can do for us in this respect is as nothing when compared to that which was done for us at the price of the Precious Blood.[52]

Mother of Men

The spiritual motherhood of Mary is situated between her office as co-redemptrix and that of advocate, which she discharges in the distribution of graces. Maternity, like paternity, bespeaks a relation to filiation. But filiation is of two kinds: *natural* and *adoptive*. Natural filiation proceeds from generation, by which one living being proceeds from another with an identity of nature. Adoptive filiation proceeds from adoption, by which a person who is a stranger to the adopting parent is accepted as a son or daughter and enjoys all the rights as such, especially that of inheritance. Men may also become adopted sons of God because man is a stranger to the blessings of grace and glory, but through the divine liberality, he is constituted a son through grace and an heir of the heavenly inheritance. And thus the Apostle says: "He predestined us to be adopted through Jesus Christ as His sons" (Eph. 1:5); "but if we arc sons, we arc heirs also' (Rom. 8:17); "so that he is no longer a slave, but a son; and if a son, an heir also through God" (Gal. 4:7). But there is a great difference between human and divine adoption. Human adoption is concerned only with moral and extrinsic elements, that is, certain rights and obligations, such as the right of inheritance thé obligation of submission and respect, and so forth. Divine adoption,

on the other hand, places in the soul something physical and internal, that is, sanctifying grace, which makes the adopted person a participant in the divine nature. Therefore, divine adoption is similar to a spiritual generation, since grace confers upon man a new being, a new supernatural nature, thus making him a new creature and transforming him into the image of God, according to the words of the Apostle: "If then any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the former things have passed away; behold, they are made new" (II Cor. 5:17); "but we all, with faces unveiled, reflecting as in a minor the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into His very image from glory to glory, as through the Spirit of the Lord" (II Cor. 3:18).

This divine adoption of men, being an extrinsic operation of God, is attributed to the entire Trinity, although it is appropriated to God the Father. However, the adoption is not completed without the influence of Christ the Man, since He is the principle and cause of our regeneration and vivification, in such a way that from Him as Head, we receive all there is of grace in us. For He satisfies to God for all; by His merit He acquired graces for us and He impetrated them from God so that, conformed to His image, we might live the same supernatural life that He lived in His humanity and continues to five through the ages. Hence, Christ is not only our Brother and even the Firstborn among many brethren (Rom. 8:29), but He is also our Father, as prophesied by Isaias (9:6) and taught by St. Anselm of Canterbury: "What dignity, O Virgin, could be more highly prized than to be the Mother of those to whom Christ deigned to be Father and Brother!" 83

Nevertheless, the name of Father, even with regard to divine adoption, is reserved to the First Person of the Blessed Trinity. As Philips points out, if the name of Father were given to Christ or the Holy Spirit, God the Father would be left without a proper name. Moreover, Jesus never spoke in this way, but always referred to His Father as *our* Father also.84

Taking into account the preceding observations, we pass on to the study of Mary's influence in our adoption as children of God through Jesus Christ, which is the same as studying her adoptive maternity with respect to mankind. In order to avoid all types of equivocation in this matter, let us remark that this motherhood of Mary's can truly be called *adoptive,* because it concerns the assistance she gave

in order to constitute us as adoptive children of God and to bestow upon men the grace of adoption, which certainly depends on the divine will. Therefore, this maternity is rightly attributed to Mary, presupposing the consent of the heavenly Father, and since Mary's maternal cooperation belongs entirely to the order of grace, her maternity as regards us is entirely spiritual and supernatural.

t h e s i s: *Mary is the spiritual mother of men.*

As in the natural order a woman is called and truly is a mother who gives temporal life to her offspring, so Mary is truly our Mother in tire supernatural order, *remotely* and *radically,* by giving birth to Christ, who is the life of our souls, as He testified of Himself: "I came that they may have life, and have it more abundantly" (John 10:10). But we treat here of a *proximate* and *formal* spiritual motherhood of the Blessed Virgin Mary', which refers directly, not to Christ, the Author of life, but to men, who are to be vivified in and through Christ.

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Pius VII declared that what the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, foretold of herself under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, namely, that all generations would call her blessed, was verified not only in the early centuries of the Church, when churches and altars were dedicated to her, but even in our own days, when we see a constant increase in the piety of the faithful toward "our most loving Mother and dispenser of all graces."[68]

Pope Pius VIII calls Mary "our Mother, Mother of piety and mercy, Mother of grace, to whom Christ, dying on the Cross, committed us so that as He pleaded to the Father for us, she would plead to the Son."[5β] Pope Gregory XVI repeats the same teaching and uses the same expressions.[67] Pope Leo XIII states: "O Virgin most holy, as you are the Mother of Christ, so also are you the Mother of all Christians";[68] and St. Pius X asks: "Is not Mary the Mother of Christ? Then she is our Mother also."[60]

Pope Pius XI writes: "Since she brought forth the Redeemer of the human race and of all of us, whom the Lord Christ has willed to regard as brothers, she is our most beloved Mother."[00] Tire same Pontiff has previously declared that the sorrowful Virgin shared with Christ in the work of human redemption and was constituted Mother of men.[01]

Sacred Scripture. St. John says: "Now there were standing by the Cross of Jesus His Mother and His Mother's sister, Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalen. When Jesus, therefore, saw His Mother and the disciple standing by, whom He loved, He said to His Mother, 'Woman, behold thy son.' Then He said to the disciple, 'Behold thy Mother.' And from that hour the disciple took her into his home" (19:25-27).

There are usually four senses distinguished in the words of Scripture: *literal, typical, consequent* and *accommodated.* The literal or historical sense of Scripture is that which is directly signified by the words, according to the intention of the Holy Ghost. The typical or spiritual sense is not signified immediately by the words, but by means of persons or things, disposed by God in such wise that they signify other persons or things. The person or thing taken as a sign of the other is called the type or figure; the person or thing signified is called the prototype or figured. Thus, St. Thomas says: "The author of Holy Writ is God, in whose power it is to signify His meaning, not by words only (as man also can do), but also by things themselves. So, whereas in every other science things are signified by words, this science has the property that the things signified by the words have themselves also a signification. Therefore, that first signification whereby words signify things belongs to the first sense, the historical or literal. That significaton whereby things signified by words have themselves also a signification is called the spiritual sense, which is based on the literal, and presupposes it." 62

The consequent sense is that which is deduced from the words of the Sacred Books. According to Cellini, what is deduced from the words of Scripture will either go beyond the exact meaning of the words themselves or it will not. If it goes beyond the exact meaning (and this will be determined by philology, context and other circumstances), the sense is called a consequent sense but it is also an "improper" sense of Scripture. If, on the other hand, the sense deduced docs not go beyond the meaning of the words of Scripture, it is truly a proper sense of Scripture and only improperly a consequent sense because it is not a sense deduced from the words, since the words themselves *give* that signification.03

The accommodated sense is that which is attributed to Sacred Scripture by a certain analogy beyond the intention of the author.

Some analogy or resemblance is necessary, for otherwise there would be no accommodation or adaptation, but rather a corruption or distortion of the sense.

All exegetes and theologians agree in affirming that the words of John 29:25-27, taken in their historical and literal sense, refer to Mary and to St. John as private persons, inasmuch as Christ wished by those words to provide for His Mother by commending her to the care of St. John. However, the interpreters of Scripture do not agree on the manner in which those words were directed to Mary and St. John as public persons, in such wise that John, representing the Church, would take the place of all Christians, who were commended to Mary as her children.01 Sudrez, Murillo, Knabenbauer, Corluy, Lagrange and Fillion maintain that those words can only be applied in an accommodated sense to Mary's maternity of all the faithful as represented in St. John.05 Van Stenkiste affirms that the words refer to Mary's maternity with respect to all the faithful, but the words are to be interpreted in a consequent sense, by a comparison with St. John. Just as John, by having been Christ's most faithful friend and disciple, merited to receive Mary as his Mother, so also those who are united to Christ participate in the same benefit.

The most common opinion among theologians is that the words are to be understood in a spiritual or typical sense as applying to Mary's motherhood of all of the faithful. Tims, Mary was given to all as their spiritual Mother, and St. John represented the whole Church at that moment. Pope Leo XIII gives this interpretation and appeals to the common mind of the Church: "The mystery of Christ's immense love for us is revealed with dazzling brilliance in the fact that the dying Savior bequeathed His Mother to His disciple John in the memorable testament: 'Behold thy son.' Now in John, as the Church has constantly taught, Christ designated the whole human race, and in the first rank are they who arc joined with Him by faith." 08

Christ's own words seem to demonstrate it, because in speaking to Mary from the Cross, He does not use the word *Mother,* but Woman, as if to infer that Mary is that woman announced in Genesis, the second Eve, who was to regenerate her children to the supernatural life, as opposed to the first Eve, who was the cause of the death of her children. Moreover, since Christ's words were addressed to His

Mother and to St. John in the very act of consummating His sacrifice in the public place of Calvary and before so many and varied witnesses, it was not a matter of a private and particular commendation of Mary to John, but a universal one, to all the faithful, in the person of John.

Fathers, Doctors and Theologians. Fathers of the first three centuries, such as St. Justin, St. Irenaeus and Tertullian, teach implicitly and equivalently the spiritual maternity of the Virgin, calling Mary the new Eve and stating that as the first Eve, by her disobedience, was the cause of death, Mary, by her obedience, was the cause of life for all those who live in grace. St. Irenaeus speaks most clearly when he calls Christ "the Firstborn of the Virgin." That is, the first in the new spiritual family engendered by Mary.*7

From the fourth century to our own day, the Fathers and theologians expressly proclaim the spiritual motherhood of Mary, calling her "Mother of the living," "Mother of the members" (whose Head is Christ), "Mother of grace," "Mother of mercy," "Mother of Christians," "spiritual Mother," "our Mother." 08

St. Bernard, although a most devoted son of Mary, never called her the Mother of men, perhaps because he never found this title mentioned in St. Ambrose or St. Augustine, whom he always followed most closely. Nevertheless, he speaks of Mary as the Mother of mercy and the Mother of charity and uses other titles which not only presuppose the Virgin's spiritual maternity, but present her as exercising maternal offices for men.®"

The Mind of the Faithful. Pope Leo XIII states in *Adjutricem populi* tirât the faithful have had recourse to Mary as *if* by instinct, placing in her hands all their joys and sorrows and commending themselves to her in all things like true children. Both publicly and privately they have gone to her as their Mother, asking her for spiritual and temporal goods.

Theological Argument. Like natural motherhood, spiritual motherhood is also the result of generation—the generation of children to a supernatural life. Therefore, the Blessed Virgin is truly the spiritual Mother of Men, since she efficaciously cooperated in regenerating them to a supernatural life by her initial assistance in the redemptive Incarnation and by her continued cooperation in Redemption, whose purpose was to regenerate mankind in the supernatural life.

Moreover, the office of mother docs not end with the conception and birth of children, but extends to the nourishing and help of the same until their full development and maturity has been reached So far as she can, the mother protects, preserves and defends her children from the dangers which could harm them from without. Hence, it is proper for Mary as Mother to feed, preserve and defend her adopted children, that they may grow until Christ is formed in them, attaining perfect manhood in Christ, for it is proper that the one who gives existence to a thing should also give it the perfection due to it.

t h e s i s: Mary was *constituted the spiritual Mother of men* in*choatively at the Annunciation and her maternity was consummated by her compassion at the Cross.*

Theologians speak differently on this question. Bainvel, deducing Mary's spiritual maternity from her consent to the Incarnation, asserts that she became our Mother at the Annunciation and would have been our Mother even if she had died before Jesus suffered on Calvary.[70] Sinibaldi distinguishes two moments, that of the conception and that of childbirth, and maintains that Mary, conceiving Christ at the Annunciation, jointly conceived His mystical body, which would be bom on Calvary amid great suffering.[71] Bittremicux speaks of the double title by which Mary became our Mother: by her compassion on Calvary and by Christ's words on the Cross addressed to His Mother and to St. John.[72]

It would seem more proper to distinguish two periods in Mary's spiritual maternity. In the first, she became our Mother inchoatively; in the second, by the sole title of her association with Christ in the work of redemption, which took its origin in the Incarnation and was completed on the Cross, she became our Mother perfectly."

First Part. *Magisterium of the Popes.* St. Pius X writes: "For is not Mary the Mother of Christ? Then she is our Mother also. . . . Wherefore, in the same holy bosom of His most chaste Mother, Christ took to Himself flesh, and united to Himself the spiritual body formed by those who were to believe in Him. Hence Mary, carrying the Savior within her, may be said to have carried also all those whose life was contained in the life of the Savior. Therefore, all we who are united to Christ and, as the Apostle says, are 'mem·

hereof His body, of His flesh, and of His bones' (Eph. 5:30), have issued from the womb of Mary like a body united to its head. Hence, in a spiritual and mystical fashion, we arc ail children of Mary, and she is Mother of us all." 74

Pope Pius XI says: "We should mention another role of the motherhood of Mary, which is still more pleasant and delightful. Since she brought forth the Redeemer of the human race and of all of us, whom the Lord Christ has willed to regard as brothers, she is our most beloved Mother" (Rom. 8:29).78

The Fathers and Doctors. St. Ambrose, Salmerôn and Orosius deduce Mary's spiritual motherhood at the Annunciation from the words of the Canticle of Canticles: "Thy belly is like a heap of wheat, set about with lilies."78 Christ is the grain of wheat which virtually contains many grains (the elect).77

St. Augustine: "[She is] spiritually the Mother, not indeed of our Head, i.e, the Savior Himself, from whom rather she is spiritually bom, but [the spiritual Mother] of His members, i.e., ourselves, because she cooperated in love toward the birth of faithful [Christians] in the Church, who are members of that Head; bodily she is truly the Mother of that Head."78

St. Albert the Great states that when the Holy Spirit overshadowed the Blessed Virgin at the Annunciation, He produced the life and vivification of all Christians. He likewise states that the Church was constructed in the womb of the Virgin so that its members might be united with her Son, the Head of the mystical body.70

St. Bernardine of Siena says that by her consent to the incarnation of her Son, the Blessed Virgin sought and obtained the salvation of the faithful, whom she then carried in her womb.80

Theological Argument. The Mother of Christ, the Head, is by that very fact the Mother of the mystical body, which is composed of the faithful. The reason is that the whole Christ is Christ as Head, together with His members, according to the famous axiom of St. Augustine: "The whole Christ, He and ourselves." Yet, Mary is not the Mother of Christ and of us in the same way, since she is the natural Mother of God and our spiritual Mother. But Christ became Head of the mystical body at His conception and for that reason Mary became our spiritual Mother at the same instant.

Second Part. Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Leo XIII stated that

as she is the Mother of Christ, the Blessed Virgin is likewise Mother of all Christians, having engendered them on Calvary amid the supreme suffering of the Redeemer."[1]

Pope Pius XI affirms: "The Virgin Mary was constituted Mother of all men at the Cross of her Son." [82]

Doctors and Theologians. St. Albert the Great states that when the Mother of mercy offered herself to the Father in her greatest act of mercy on Calvary and suffered the agony of having a sword of sorrow pierce her heart, she became Christ's consort in redemption and the Mother of regeneration. Through her spiritual fecundity she regenerated all of us to eternal life in her Son.[83]

St. Antoninus says that as Christ engendered us in our spiritual being by suffering on the Cross, so Mary, by her compassion with her suffering Son, gave birth to us spiritually amid great suffering.*[1]

St. Alphonsus Liguori writes: "The second occasion on which Mary became our spiritual Mother and brought us forth to the life of grace was when she offered to the Eternal Father the life of her beloved Son on Calvary." [86]

Theological Argument. Although Christ's passion and death were not absolutely necessary for the redemption of mankind, because Christ, as a Person of infinite dignity, could have merited salvation for all men in any way He wished, nevertheless, God decreed that redemption and, consequently, the adoption of men as His sons, would not be consummated except by Christ's most cruel passion and death on the Cross. Now, presupposing Mary's association with Christ the Redeemer, it was also decreed that Mary's spiritual motherhood and our adoptive filiation with respect to her would be consummated at the Cross of our Lord, where Mary, standing near her dying Son, engendered all Christians to supernatural life.

Moreover, Mary became the Mother of the members of Christ's mystical body in a complete and perfect manner when Christ was *formally* constituted as its Head. This was accomplished on the Cross, where the redemption of all was completed, as the Apostle says: "It is in this 'will' that we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Hcb. 10:10). Mary, therefore, was totally constituted Mother of mankind on Calvary'.

That Christ became Head of the human race on the Cross is manifest, because in tire mystical head, just as in a natural one,

four things must be considered: 1) the identity of nature with its members; 2) the pre-eminence of the head over the members; 3) the intimate union of head and members so as to form a whole organism; 4) the vivifying influx which gives movement and life to the members. The last-mentioned is the principal element, for if it be halted, the members will necessarily die and will cease being members of the mystical body. Now, it is certain that from the beginning of the Incarnation Christ had a conformity of nature with His members, principality and pre-eminence over them and a close bond with them, because by sharing our human nature He became most apt as Mediator and Head of the human race. Moreover, being hypostatically united to God, Christ enjoyed principality among all other men. But the vivifying influence over the members and the intimate union that results from it through the communication *of* supernatural life depended on the passion and death of Christ, since the grace of headship became active through His merit and satisfaction on the Cross. Actually, since no grace comes to us from Christ the Head which does not also come to us from Christ the Redeemer, the Apostle could say: "For by one offering He has perfected forever those who arc sanctified" (Heb. 10:14); and St. Jerome could say: "He died that we might live."

For that reason, Nicholas Cabasilas remarks that we were not members of Christ until after Christ died and paid tlie price of our ransom, thereby breaking the bonds of our servitude with the devil, making us adopted sons and members of that blessed Head.·· And Janssens says that Christ may be considered under three aspects: God, the God-Man, and the God-Man the Redeemer. Under any of these aspects God is the Head, but most formally He is our Head under the third aspect.[87]

Thus are reconciled those opinions of the Fathers which at first glance appear contrary. It is the common teaching of the Fathers that the mystical body of Christ was constituted by the death of the Redeemer on the Cross. Notwithstanding, they also maintain that this mystical body took its origin in tlie Incarnation.[88]

Corollaries. From what has been said, it is concluded that Mary, through her initial consent to the redemptive Incarnation, and through her compassion at the foot of the Cross, is the spiritual Mother of all, not only of the whole human race, but of each in-

dividual man, of whom she is actually and simply Mother, inasmuch as she obtains for them the grace by which they arc bom to the supernatural life.

It also follows that it was most fitting that Christ, hanging on the Cross, should proclaim Mary the Mother of men. In the act of consummating the redemption, from which, with Mary's cooperation, was bom the multitude of believers, or better still, the mystical body of Christ, the Redeemer sanctioned and solemnly proclaimed the spiritual motherhood of Mary.

All men, represented in John, are assigned to Mary as children and are placed under the protection of her love and solicitude as Mother. And thus Pope Leo XIII says: "She is gentle, exquisite in tenderness, and of a limitless love and kindness. As such God gave her to us. Having chosen her for the Mother of His only-begotten Son, He taught her all a mother's feeling that breathes nothing but pardon and love." 80

"No tongue is eloquent enough to put in words what every devout soul feels, namely, how intense is the flame of affectionate and active charity which glows in Mary', in her who is truly our Mother, not in a human way but through Christ." 00

t h e s i s : The *extension of Mary's spiritual motherhood.*

Mary's motherhood extends in some way to all men, as Pope Leo XIII declares: "As such He proclaimed her from the Cross when He entrusted to her care and love the whole of the race of man in the person of His disciple John." 01 And truly, such is the connection between Mary's spiritual maternity and Christ as Head of the mystical body that Mary is the spiritual Mother of all who in any way have Christ as their Head. But as Christ is not the Head of all men in the same degree, neither does Mary's spiritual maternity extend to all in the same way.

Man's natural body and Christ's mystical body differ in this that the members of the natural body are all actual members, while those of the mystical body may be members either actually or potentially. Thus, the members of the mystical body may be divided into five categories: i) primarily and principally Christ is Head of those who are united to Him by glory; 2) He is Head of those who are united to Him through actual charity, as are the souls in purgatory and the

just souls on earth; 3) He is Head of those who are united to Him by faith, that is to say, the sinners among the faithful who, although separated from God by sin, are nevertheless united to Him through the bond of faith; 4) He is Head of those who are united to Him only in potency, which will eventually be reduced to act according to divine predestination; 5) He is Head of those who are in potency to be united with Him but *de facto* they will never be actual members through faith and charity.

Besides these members, there is a sixth category of men and it comprises those who are in the condition of eternal damnation to the suffering of pain and loss or those who are in the condition of loss only but without the pain.

Tire distinctions just given in regard to Christ's mystical body may be applied to Mary also. Primarily and principally she is the actual Mother of all the blessed in heaven, where the adoption as sons is perfect. Thus, the Apostle says: "We ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption as sons, the redemption of our bod/' (Rom. 8:24). Less perfectly, but still in a most excellent manner, the Blessed Virgin is actually the Mother of all the just, for whom she is constantly obtaining sanctity and justice. St. Albert the Great says in this respect that the Blessed Virgin still nourishes Christ, formed in the souls of many, and if the newly formed Christ is not nourished, He will perish.[02] To a much more imperfect degree Mary is also actually the Mother of the faithful who are in sin, for although they are dried branches, they are nevertheless united to Christ by the bond of faith, which is the beginning of the spiritual life. Potentially, Mary is the Mother of all those non-believers who, according to divine predestination, will one day be converted to faith in Christ and she is likewise the potential Mother of all non-believers who will never be converted. But Mary is in no sense the Mother of the condemned, for they can never share in the supernatural life of the Head of the mystical body. Consequently, Mary is in some way the Mother of all men, except the damned.[03]

Advocate and Patroness of the Human Race

The other element which is included in Mary's title of mcdiatrii is the office of advocate and patroness of the human race, close to God in the dispensation of graces, an office she exercises in heaven by her most powerful intercession. The Greek word for advocate means one who is presented or called upon to give assistance and to be prompt to help one in need or danger by means of counsel or in any other way whatever. The word has been preserved in legal terminology to signify one who comes to the aid of the defenders of a case to give advice and counsel and to appeal to the judges. In ancient times the advocate was distinguished from the patron in that the latter was the speaker in the trial and the former assisted the patron and instructed him in the law. Both offices are now performed by the advocate alone. Therefore, the advocate is not only the speaker or defender of the case, and the patron of the client, but he instructs his client so that he may know how to plead his case and be successful in it.

t h e s i s: Mary, *the Mother of God, is the advocate and patroness of the human race.*

Errors. Some Protestants raise severe objections to the titles of advocate and patroness and similar titles applied to Mary. They say that in attributing these offices to her, we make her equal to Christ and, with obvious injustice, we lessen His titles and offices by dividing them with the Virgin.

The Jansenists rule out the titles of advocate and patroness, as can be seen in Admonitions IX and X of Widenfeldt. In these Admonitions the author denies that those titles belong to Mary in a proper manner, and at the same time he warns against titles that are hyperbolic and improper.®*

Magisterium *of the Popes.* Pope Boniface IX, Pope Pius VII and Pope Pius XI all proclaim Mary as advocate.05

Sacred *Scripture.* In John 19:26, it is related that Christ, as He was dying, said to His Mother in respect to John: "Woman, behold thy son." On this, Toledo comments: "Tire Lord entrusted all of us to the care, protection and intercession of the Blessed Virgin,

giving us confidence in having recourse to her in all things as our Mother and dearest Lady." 88

Fathers and Theologians. St. Irenaeus calls Mary the "advocate of Eve," and St. Ephrem calls her "the friendly advocate of sinners." M

"And who," exclaims St. Germanus, "after thy Jesus, is as tenderly solicitous for our welfare as thou art? Who defends us in the temptations with which we are afflicted as thou defendest us? Who, like thee, undertakes to protect sinners, fighting, as it were, in their behalf?" ·'

St. Bernard says that the Mother of the Judge and the Mother of mercy has preceded us in order to take as her own the matter of our salvation.08

"Honor as much as you can," says St. Bonaventure, "that glorious Queen, the Blessed Mother of the Lord, and have recourse to her in all your needs as to a most secure refuge; take her as your advocate; commend all things to her devoutly and confidently, because she is the Mother of mercy; strive to pay her special reverence each day."100

Raymond Jourdain says: "Tire divine Mother, as Queen of all, is the advocate of all. Mary, as our most loving advocate, herself offers the prayers of her servants to God, ... for as the Son intercedes for us with the Father, so does she intercede with the Son, and does not cease to make interest with both for the great affair of our salvation, and to obtain for us the graces we ask."101

The Liturgy invokes Mary thus: "Turn then, most gracious advocate, thine eyes of mercy toward us."102

Theological Argument. Mary is the most fitting person to be the advocate and patroness of the human race in the matter of eternal salvation. On the one hand, she enjoys ineffable power close to God, from whom all good proceeds, and on the other, she has a great anxiety for our salvation; she is always solicitous in obtaining the necessary graces for those who work to obtain it; she distributes those graces unceasingly; and she gives her assistance to anyone who is in danger.

t h e s i s: *Mary exercises the office of advocate in heaven, interceding for men and obtaining for them the graces of salvation.*

Errors. The Lutherans and Calvinists deny that the saints, includ-

ing the Blessed Virgin, pray for us, although some have abandoned their ancient prejudices on this question. They deny any such intercession because they maintain that there is only one Mediator, Jesus Christ, whose intercession and merit arc not only sufficient but superabundant.

Councils and Magisterium of the Popes. The Roman Council of 983 explicitly affirmed that we are assisted by the prayers and merits of the saints.[108] The Council of Trent declared: "The saints, who are reigning with Christ, offer their prayers to God for mcn."[1M] This would apply likewise to the Blessed Virgin Mary, who is Mother of us all and Queen of all saints.

The *Roman Catechism* states that wc should constantly invoke the Mother of mercy and advocate of the Christian people so that she will pray for us sinners, and in our petitions we should ask her assistance, since no one can deny, without the basest impiety, that her merits before God are most eminent and she has a great desire to help mankind.[105]

Pope Sixtus IV stated that it was fitting and obligatory for all the faithful to thank Almighty God for the conception of the immaculate Virgin and to assist at the liturgy in her honor so that through her intercession they might be better prepared to receive divine grace.[106]

Pope Pius VII says that Mary strives so earnestly to obtain divine aid for us that just as God came to earth through her, so men rise to heaven through her.[107]

Pope Leo XIII affirms that by reason of her lofty and perpetual ministry, Mary must defend our cause.[108]

Fathers and Theologians. St. Ephrem speaks most clearly about Mary's intercession on our behalf when he addresses her in the following words: "Never cease to intercede for us, thy unworthy servants, but preserve us from condemnation by thy supplications until the end of our life." [loe]

St. Germanus of Constantinople asks the Blessed Virgin: "Who cares for the human race as you do, in the likeness of your only-begotten Son? Who defends us in our miseries? Who exerts such eSort in interceding for sinners as you do? You who enjoy the confidence and power of Mother in regard to your Son, guard and defend

by youi intercession and petitions those who are condemned by reason of their faults, who would not even dare to look up to heaven, and free them from everlasting yearning."[110]

St. Bernard says: "Let us seek grace and let us seek it through Marj', for she finds what she seeks and is never frustrated; the Son will listen to His Mother and she will be heard out of His reverence for her."[111]

The Liturgy. To all that has been said, we may add the testimony of all ancient liturgies, Eastern and Western, in which the Church asks for the forgiveness of sinners and for other favors through the merits and intercession of the Blessed Virgin.

Theological Argument. Mary is the dispensatrix of all graces, graces which she cannot confer except by interceding and expressing her desire to Christ and, with Christ, to the Father. This intercession of Mary's is not opposed nor prejudicial to that of Christ, for Christ is the principal intercessor, and Mary intercedes for us by a secondary intercession.

t h e s i s: *Mary prays for us in heaven with explicit and formal prayer.*

Previous Observations. Prayer of petition or intercession may be formal and explicit or interpretative. Formal and explicit prayer of petition is the act by which the suppliant asks some favor of God. Interpretative prayer is the subjective merit already existing in the presence of God, or the manifestation or presentation of other merits which pertain to the petitioner, by which God is moved to confer gifts, without any actual petition.

It is well known that while He lived on earth, Christ prayed for men, as is related in St. Luke: "Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing" (23:34), and in St. John: "I pray for them; not for the world do I pray, but for those whom Thou hast given Me" (17:9)· It is also certain that Christ, now glorious in heaven, prays for us, as is stated in the first Epistle of St. John ("But if anyone sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just" [2:1]), the Epistle to the Hebrews ("But He, because He continues forever, has an everlasting priesthood. Therefore He is able at all times to save those who come to God through Him, since He

lives always to make intercession for them" [7:24-25]) and in the Epistle to the Romans ("Who shall make accusation against the elect of God? It is God who justifies! Who shall condemn? It is Jesus Christ who died; yes, and rose again, He who is at the right hand of God, who also intercedes for us" [8:33-34]).

With regard to the manner of Christ's intercession for us in heaven near the Father, it is the common teaching that He does so *interpretatively,* displaying His most sacred humanity with His wounds, merits and satisfactions, by which God is moved to bestow His gifts to men. St. Gregory says: "For the only-begotten Son to pray for men, it suffices for Him to show Himself as Man to the Eternal Father." 1,2

Theologians arc not agreed whether the glorified Christ intercedes for us in a formal and explicit manner. Nevertheless, all agree on the following: Christ, in order to pray for us in heaven, cannot make use of external signs of humiliation.'18 The explicit prayer of Christ in heaven, if it exists, cannot be a supplication as from an inferior person imploring mercy, but would be an expression of the desire of His holy soul for human salvation, so that God will fulfill it, preserving always the all-powerful force of His divine will and the equality of the divine Persons. If the foregoing imperfections are removed, Suârez, Petau, Franzelin, Stentrup, Müller, Lercher, Paquet and several other theologians admit the existence of formal and explicit prayer in the glorified Christ. On the other hand, Somnio, Medina, Vâzquez, Thomassin and De la Taille defend interpretative prayer exclusively.

It is certain that Mary intercedes for us in heaven with interpretative prayer or intercession. In support of this, we have the statements of St. Ephrem, Arnold of Chartres and others.114 But we are here treating principally of the explicit and formal prayer with which Mary intercedes to God for us.

The *Fathers.* Theophilus Alexandrinus states that the prayers of His Mother are a pleasure to the Son, because He desires to grant all that is granted on her account, as a recompense for the favor she did to Him in giving Him His body.116

St. Bernard: "Speak, O Lady, for thy Son hcareth thee, and whatever thou askest thou wilt obtain." 110

The Liturgy. In the Collect of the Mass of the Blessed Virgin for Saturdays we pray: "Grant us, Thy servants, . . . and by the glorious intercession of the blessed Mary ever Virgin. . . We also have a practice in the Church of answering in the litanies: *Pray for us,* asking Mary to present our needs and to pray and intercede continually to God for us.

Theological Argument. Mary is our advocate, and it is proper to the office of an advocate to intercede for clients. This the Blessed Virgin accomplishes with prayer that is not only interpretative, but also actual and explicit. First, there is no reason whatever why explicit prayer should be improper to Mary, since it neither presupposes nor requires new merits, which she cannot acquire in the state of glory. Secondly, there is no detriment to the power she has in heaven, because it would not require omnipotence *simpliciter* but only a suppliant omnipotence for the fulfillment of her petition by God. Thirdly, Mary's prayer is not futile because she knows in advance whether a thing asked for in prayer has already been denied or granted in the divine decree, since the providence of God pre-ordains things in such a manner that some will succeed independent of our prayers while others will happen with dependence on prayer. Thus, Mary's explicit petitions on our behalf do produce the effects which are sought.'[17]

t h e s i s: *The prayer of the Mother of God is more efficacious and powerful than the prayers of all the saints together.*

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Pius VII says that the prayers of the blessed depend solely on the divine benignity, but the prayers of Mary rest on her maternal rights.[118]

Pope Leo XIII also taught that the intercession *of* our blessed Lady is of a much higher order than is that of all the other saints. These are his words: "Now, of all the blessed in heaven, who can compare with the august Mother of God in obtaining grace? Who sees more clearly in the Eternal Word what troubles oppress us, what arc our needs? Who is allowed more power in moving God? Who can compare with her in maternal affection? We do not pray to the blessed in the same way as to God, for we ask the Holy Trinity to have mercy on us. but we ask the saints to pray for us. Yet our

manner of praying to the Blessed Virgin has something in common with our worship of God, so that the Church even addresses to her the words with which we pray to God: 'Have mercy on sinners."''›·

The Fathers and Theologians. St. Ephrem praises Mary's intercession as surpassing that of all the saints by saying that she has the greatest access to Him who was born of her.120

St. Peter Damian: "To have recourse to her is the greatest hope, since among all the senators in the heavenly curia, she has the first place next to God." 121

St. Anselm says that the world has good and even excellent helpers, apostles, patriarchs, prophets, martyrs, confessors and virgins to whom one can address his prayer, but Mary is the best and most excellent of all.122

Richard of St. Victor: "If the angels and holy souls have a care for sinners and help them by their merits and prayers, we must believe that the Blessed Virgin can do as much in this regard as those creatures and much more than they." 123

Richard of St. Lawrence says that whereas the angels and saints can petition God and be heard by Him, Mary can, as His Mother, command her Son.124

St. Antoninus explains that the petitions of the saints rely on the mercy of God, but those of Mary arc based on divine grace, natural law and the justice of the Gospel. The reason is that a son is not only bound to listen to his parents, but to obey them. Therefore, Mary's intercession is the most exalted, as was prefigured in the words of Solomon to Bcthsabee: "My mother, ask; for I must not turn away thy face" (III Kings 2:20).128

Theological Argument. St. Thomas explains that the greater and more perfect the charity of the saints in heaven, the more they pray for wayfarers on earth, since the latter can be helped by their prayers; and the more closely they are united to God, the more efficacious are their prayers.'28 Now, Mary surpasses all the saints in charity and is more closely united to God than they, for they are only servants and adopted children of God, while she is the Mother of God, and so very close to God, that she is, as it were, inscribed in the divine family. That being the case, Sudrez reasonably concludes that the Blessed Virgin surpasses in power and efficacy of intercession not only each of the saints individually, but the whole heavenly court

thesis : So *great is Mary's power of intercession that it is rigjitly called an omnipotent supplication.*

Previous Observations. From the wording of the thesis it is evident that we are not speaking of omnipotence *simpliciter,* for that is proper to God alone. Therefore, Mary's power is only *morally* omnipotent, that is, omnipotent by way of impétration, for she obtains for us the graces and other favors which she begs for us. Keeping this in mind, it is easy to interpret correctly the meaning of the formulas frequently used in order to extol Mary's power of intercession, in which she is represented as praying in such a way that, as she approaches her Son, she seems not to beg, but to command. These expressions cannot be taken too rigorously, however, for they are used in a metaphorical and not in a strict sense.128 Hence, it cannot be said that Mary commands God, but that by a singular privilege, her prayers and desires possess an efficacy similar to that of a command.

This powerful impétration of Mary must be placed within the limits of her exalted mediation, since it cannot surpass the power of the humanity of Christ, whose consort she is in the work of redemption. And the power of Christ, which accomplished so many marvelous supernatural and preternatural works, was directed to the purpose of the Incarnation, which is to reestablish all things that are in heaven and on earth.120

Lastly, it is well to consider that Mary's power of intercession, which cannot be frustrated, refers to those things which Mary asks in an absolute way, in conformity with her rational will, of which we shall speak later.

Errors, lire Jansenists, as usual, oppose the eulogies with which the Fathers and theologians enthusiastically praise the power and efficacy of Mary's intercession, and they reject that beautiful formula in which Mary is acclaimed as omnipotent suppliant, as seen in VVidcnfeldt's X Admonition.130

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Pius IX favors this doctrine when he says that Mary, with her only-begotten Son, is the most powerful mediatrix and conciliatrix in the whole world. He adds: "Under her guidance, under her patronage, under her kindness and protection, nothing is to be feared, nothing is hopeless. Because, while bearing toward us a truly motherly affection and taking care of the work of

our salvation, she is solicitous about the whole human race. And, since she has been appointed by God to be the Queen of heaven and earth, and is exalted above all the other choirs of angels and saints, and even stands at the right hand of her only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, she presents our petitions in a most efficacious manner. What she petitions, she obtains. Her pleas can never be unheard." 181

Pope Leo XIII says: "Mary is this glorious intermediary. She is the might}' Mother of God." 182 "And truly the immaculate Virgin, chosen to be the Mother of God and thereby associated with Him in the work of man's salvation, has a favor and power with her Son greater than any human or angelic creature has ever obtained or ever can obtain." 188

St. Pius X writes: "We know, indeed, from experience that such prayer, bom of charity and trust in the Virgin, has never been vain."184

In a letter addressed to His Eminence Cardinal Maglionc (April 15, 1940), Pope Pius XII, so greatly grieved over the innumerable and grave evils of the war in which all of Europe was involved, exhorted all the faithful, particularly the children and youth, to direct their prayers to Mary's intercession in obtaining, as soon as possible, the end of so horrible a war, and a return of peace.

The *Fathers and Theologians.* It will suffice to quote two of the many Fathers and theologians, among whom are St. Ephrem, St. Germanus of Constantinople, St. John Damascene, St. Euthymius, St. Peter Damian, St. Anselm, Eadmcr, Raymond Jourdain, George of Nicomedia, Adam of Persenia, and Abbot Godfrey.130

Germanus of Constantinople: "For thou, who by thy maternal authority hast great power with God, dost obtain the very great grace of reconciliation even for those who have been guilty of grievous crimes. It is impossible that thou shouldst not be graciously heard; for God in all things complies with thy wishes as being those of his true and spotless Mother." 188

Abbot Godfrey: "The other saints pray to God and, by praying, obtain what they ask, but the glorious Virgin Mary, though she surely prays to Him as God and Lord, nevertheless, since as man He was bom of her, we piously believe that she approaches Him with a certain command as His Mother and obtains what she seeks." 181

The Common Belief of the Faithful. In every necessity the Christian people have most confidently had recourse to Mary's protection, for they believed that she was most powerful in obtaining what they desired from God. This is evident, for example, in the widespread recitation of the Memorare: "Remember, O most glorious Virgin Mary, that never was it known that anyone who fled to thy protection, implored thy help, or sought thy intercession, was left unaided." Further evidence is found in the universal devotion to Our Lady of Perpetual Help.

Theological Argument. It is most fitting that the Blessed Virgin should possess such great power of intercession, and that by a double title: by reason of her divine maternity and by reason of her association in the work of redemption.

1) By *reason of her divine maternity.* Mary, by reason of her divine maternity, acquired new and marvelous relations with God the Father. She can claim one and the same Son with the Father, though she does not bear the same relation to her divine Son as does God the Father. He is bom of the Father from all eternity; He was bom of Mary in time. The Father generated His Son according to His divine nature; Mary gave birth to Him according to His human nature. Hence, between Mary and God the Father there exists a certain parental unity and juridical partnership. Similarly, she has a special relationship with the Holy Spirit, hy whose operation she conceived Christ the Savior, God and man. Therefore, she is rightly called the consort of the Father in the generation of the Son and the spouse of the Holy Spirit as well as His sanctuary and temple. It is evident from these titles that Mary's prayers must be most powerful and efficacious.

Moreover, as the true Mother of Christ, Mary works with her Son, interceding for us by maternal right. And this right calls forth an obligation in Christ to grant what she asks. By the very fact that she gave Christ the flesh with which He was invested, Mary became the creditor of her Son and her Son became debtor of His Mother. It is therefore her unique privilege that God is obligated to her in this respect, but is obliged to the rest of the saints at most by virtue of some promise.188 We say that Christ is obligated to His Mother antecedent to any promise because she gave Him His existence as man, and while the fullness of grace she received was through the

merits of Christ (and under this aspect the Mother is indebted to the Son), He nevertheless delights in answering her prayers because in that way He repays her for the favor she did Him in giving Him His body.'"·

Again, Mary', the Mother of Christ, has a right to Ilis love, since children owe their parents love as well as honor and respect. Now, this right of Mary's to the love of her Son is also, in a certain way, a right to having her prayers heard and her desires fulfilled, as Bossuet points out when he says that Christ's love for Mary prompts Him to grant her requests for others."0

The divine maternity is the root of all of Mary's prerogatives and, in the first place, of her grace and ardent charity, with the result that, after Christ, she is the standard-bearer in divine love, loving God much more than all the saints together. Therefore, as her love is the most intense, so also is her power of impétration.141

2) By *reason of her association in the work of redemption.* As Christ's partner in the work of human redemption, the Blessed Virgin merited for us in her way all that Christ merited for us in His way. Now, if Christ's intercession, which is founded on His condign merits of redemption, requires by right that He obtain what He asks, so Mary's intercession, based on her merits, has a right to be granted, and her clients should receive what she asks for them.

t h e s i s: Whether *Mary's prayer was and is always heard.*

At first glance it would seem that Mary's prayer is always heard, for her omnipotent supplication should always obtain what it asks. But we have already implied that Mary's intercession, which cannot be frustrated, must be restricted to those things she petitions in an absolute manner, in conformity with the rational will.

In the Blessed Virgin we must distinguish a twofold will: the essential will and the will by participation. The first is the inclination to the good as apprehended by reason or the intellect; the second, which is also called the will of sensuality, is the sensitive appetite, as subject to reason.142 The essential or rational will is a single potency, but in relation to its acts it is divided into the will of nature (per modum *naturae)* and the will of reason *(per modum rationis).* The will of nature is the principle of the movements which are concerned with the body needs or instincts or with objects considered

as harmful or beneficial. The will of reason is the principle of deliberate movements and inclinations or those which follow the consideration of all the circumstances and relations of an object with respect to the good of the end.[143] The will of nature should be called velleity or will *secundum quid;* the will of reason is the will *simpliciter* or absolutely.

It is not unbecoming to say that the prayer of the Blessed Virgin according to the will of nature or sensitive appetite could go unanswered. For it is evident that she could pray in this manner, presenting to God what was in conformity with her sensitive appetite, for example, asking, as did Christ, that if it were possible, the chalice of her maternal compassion might pass, for it is proper to her as Mother that her sensitive appetite should feel aversion for the passion of her Son. By natural instinct we are inclined to that which is good and pleasing, but repelled by that which is evil or harmful. There is nothing unworthy of Mary in this, but it is in complete harmony with Christ, for in his prayer in Gethsemane Christ gave expression to the sensitive will and thereby demonstrated that He had a true human nature. But He subjected His lower appetite to His rational will and that, in turn, to the will of His Father. So also, the Blessed Virgin, truly possessing human nature with its natural instincts, could will, according to the sensitive appetite, something not willed by God, but she submitted to the divine will, as Christ did when He said: "Yet not My will but Thine be done" (Luke 22:42).

The prayer of Mary according to her rational will is always heard. A prayer is said to be heard when the rational will of the one praying is fulfilled. Therefore, Mary's prayer is always heard, because her rational will always obtains complete results. The reason is that Mary never wills anything by her rational will unless it is in accord with the divine will.[144]

t h e s i s: *Whether Mary intercedes for the saints in heaven.*

It is certain that the souls of all the blessed in heaven have attained salvation through the intercession and with the help of the Blessed Virgin. This we have on the testimony of St. Ephrem, St. Germanus of Constantinople and Denis the Carthusian, who says: "Who is there that is saved? Who is there that reigns in heaven?"

And he answers, "They are certainly saved and reign in heaven for whom this Queen of mercy intercedes." 145

Truly, every grace that is bestowed on man is granted through the intercession of Mary', and since eternal life is grace, and indeed the coronation of grace, or the ultimate flowering of which grace is the seed (I John 3:9), it follows that salvation is due to her prayers. For that reason, the Church exclaims at Lauds on the feast of the Seven Dolors: "And when I must leave this world, grant me, 0 Christ, the palm of victory through the prayers of Thy Mother."

But once the saints and blessed enjoy the eternal happiness of heaven, Mary does not ask any graces for them whatever. In the first place, they are not in need of anything, for they are filled with the delights of the house of God (Ps. 35:9). So St. Augustine says: "In heaven there is no reason to pray but only to praise. And why no reason to pray? Because nothing is lacking. What we believe here, we see there; what we hope for here, we possess there; and what we ask for here, we receive there." 148 Secondly, the essential glory and degree of grace of the saints in heaven cannot be increased by anyone's prayers, for death has ended the time of meriting, and God has ordained that each will attain a definite degree of glory according to his merits. Thus the Apostle says: "Each will receive his own reward according to his labor" (I Cor. 3:8).

However, Mary can contribute in some way by her prayers to the accidental glory of the blessed by granting them greater honor, reverence and confidence on the part of the faithful who have recourse to them. Thus, the angels and saints, desirous as they are for the salvation of men, will ask Mary to have pity on us or they will bring the petitions of their clients to her and ask her to intervene. In this way the efficacious intercession of Mary adds greater efficacy to the prayers of the saints and brings greater glory to them from the faithful.147

t h e s i s: Whether *Mary prays for the souls in purgatory.*

It is certain that the blessed in heaven pray for the souls in purgatory. St. Augustine attests to this fact when he says that it is beneficial to the dead to be buried in the basilicas of the martyrs, so that when anyone remembers the dead person, he will also remember the martyr and will recommend the departed to the prayers and protec-

tion of the martyr.148 Moreover, the Church asks the assistance of the blessed in public prayers for the departed: "Come to her (or his) assistance, all ye saints of God; meet her (or him), all ye angels of God";149 "Almighty and everlasting God, who hast dominion over the living and the dead, and art merciful to all who Thou foreknowest shall be Thine by faith and good works, we humbly beseech Tliec, that they for whom we intend to pour forth our prayers, whether this present world still detain them in the flesh, or the world to come hath already received them out of their bodies, may through the intercession of all Thy saints, by the clemency *of Thy* goodness, obtain the remission of all their sins." 100 Lastly, we can refer to the dogma of the communion of saints or the union which exists between the members of the universal Church of Christ, militant, suffering and triumphant, to form one mystical body whose Head is Christ.101

It is easy to deduce from all this that Mary prays for the souls in purgatory. The Church confirms it in the following prayer in the Mass for the dead: "O God, who dost grant forgiveness and desire the salvation of mankind; we beseech Thee in Thy mercy to grant that the brethren of our congregation, their relatives and benefactors who have passed out of this life, may partake of everlasting bliss by the intercession of blessed Mary ever Virgin and of all Thy saints." 1,2 Moreover, the argument based on the communion *of* saints has special application to the Blessed Virgin. She is not only the principal member of the mystical body of Christ, but also the Mother of the Head and members, and the illustrious consort of Christ in the redemption of the members of that body, whose incorporation will ultimately be completed and consummated in heaven. Hence, Mary is always solicitous to gather together in heaven all the souls in purgatoiy.

t h e s i s: *In what ways Mary exercises her intercession for the souls in purgatory.*

It is a common opinion among theologians that Mary's intercession for the souls in purgatory can be exercised in these four ways: i) by asking Christ to apply to those souls from His infinite satisfaction whatever is necessary to free them from their sufferings; a) by applying or presenting to God out of the merits and satisfactions of her

mortal life what is needed to free the souls from purgatory; 3) by asking Christ, as His Mother, to give grace and assistance to those who are still living, so that they may be moved frequently to offer suffrages and satisfactions for the souls in purgatory; 4) by using her powerful intercession so that God will apply to these souls the suffrages intended by the faithful for souls who do not need them because they are already in heaven, or who cannot benefit by them, because they have been condemned for all eternity.

But theologians are not agreed in affirming whether the prayer or intercession of Mary is sufficient of itself to assist and to free the souls in purgatory. In the first place, it must be presupposed that prayers which are at once impetratory and satisfactory, as are those of wayfarers, can benefit the souls in purgatory in the remission of their punishment. Secondly, prayers that are simply impetratory, as are those of the blessed, are also useful for those souls. Although they have no satisfactory value, they can at least ask that the passion of Christ and the sufferings of His saints be applied to the souls in purgatory' to that end. Hence, the controversy revolves around the following question: Whether God, by the impetratory power of prayer, freely and out of pure mercy, without any intervention of the satisfaction of Christ, remits the debt of the souls in purgatory in view of those prayers of impétration applied to the souls in purgatory to satisfy divine justice.

Opinions. Theophilus Raynaud denies that solely the prayers of the Blessed Virgin, or those of the rest of the blessed, could be sufficient to obtain the effect indicated. He goes on to say that Mary can obtain that the faithful on earth will be moved to pray for the souls in purgatory or that they be alleviated from the common treasury of the Church.[153]

Although Suarez says that the opinion which favors the sufficiency of the merely impetratory prayer of Mary, and even of wayfarers, in helping the souls in purgatory, is a pious, probable, and perhaps true opinion, he is inclined to the opposite view. His reason is that according to the ordinary law of God, no one can obtain the remission of punishment for himself, since it is the law of God that the sinner must pay his own debt. Much less, then, can he impetrate it for others.[104]

On the other hand, Peter of Palude affirms that the intercession of

the saints is always profitable to us, for while it is true that they are no longer in the condition of meriting and of satisfying, they are in the state of impctrating and of obtaining favors for us through the liberality of God, to whom they pray and to whom they are most acceptable.155 Durandus also says that the love of charity among the faithful is of such value in the sight of God that one can free others of all or part of their punishment, by praying or making satisfaction. The first method obtains the remission of punishment through the liberality of God, to whom he prays.156

Although Mary's power of intercession seems to demand the gratuitous remission of the sufferings of purgatory, we find in opposition to it the general law whereby after this life it is not grace that operates, but justice. Thus, Suarez says that it is the law of justice and divine providence that the sinner be justly punished, and the same law establishes the ordinary manner of punishment which a man is to receive.157 Actually, this question is of little practical importance, since Mary always has at her disposal the inexhaustible treasury of satisfactions, to which she unites her prayers, and thus she can satisfy the justice of God and alleviate the souls in purgatory. She can always offer, together with her prayers, her own satisfactions, those of Christ, and those of the saints.158

Corollary. Since Mary's love for the souls in purgatory is so great, it must be most pleasing to her when her clients place in her hands, and especially if they do so under a vow in favor of the souls in purgatory, all their works of satisfaction (except sacramental satisfaction), all the indulgences they can gain, and all the suffrages which will come to them after their death, that she may apply them to the souls in purgatory according to her own good pleasure. In this way they are sure of securing the greater glory of God, since Mary's will is never separated from this greater divine glory. Moreover, those gifts become more pleasing in the hands of the Blessed Virgin, so that what we cannot obtain alone by our own efforts, can be obtained through her intercession. And wc need not fear that anything will be lacking to us in purgatory because of what we have offered to Mary *for* those souls, for that act of charity (which is called heroic) is most meritorious. Further, there is no reason to think that so pious and loving a Mother would then neglect us or that she would not free us from our sufferings when we had previously given away our own

satisfactory merits out of love for her.,B® Therefore, the faithful who have made such an excellent gift should reasonably trust that Mary will shorten their stay in purgatory and increase their eternal reward in heaven.

t h e s i s : *Whether Mary's intercession extends to hell.*

It is evident that Mary, by her prayers, is able to save men from hell by impetrating for them, before their death, the help of grace so that they may pass from the state of sin to that of sanctifying grace. In this sense St. Germanus of Constantinople states that Mary frees men from eternal punishment, and St. Bernard says: "By thee was hell emptied, and heaven was filled; through thee eternal life is given to many miserable creatures who deserved eternal death."lM

But in this question we are asking about the liberation of men from the punishment of hell after death; that is, of those who leave this world in mortal sin and thus deserve eternal punishment. We must remember that according to Catholic doctrine, those adults who die in mortal sin are deserving of eternal damnation.1·1 According to God's ordinary law, this condemnation is imposed at the particular judgment, and is eternally immutable. The words "according to God's ordinary law," some theologians maintain, do not totally preclude extraordinary miraculous exceptions outside the common rule of divine justice.

Hie proposed question can have a double meaning. It may refer to those who have died in mortal sin but have not yet been consigned to hell because the divine sentence has been held in abeyance for some reason or other; or it may refer to those who have died and are already suffering the pains of hell. In the first instance, the possibility of which cannot be denied, the Blessed Virgin could intercede in behalf of those who are deserving of eternal punishment, asking God not to impose on them the definitive sentence of damnation.

Van Ketwigh maintains that it may piously be held that Mary's unlimited power of intercession may prevail on God to make a special act of His will regarding some who died in mortal sin and were deserving of hell.102 Bartmann, on the other hand, explicitly denies that this has ever happened, and brands all such stories as purely legendary. However, Bartmann states that St. Thomas (and after him all later theology), in referring to the testimony by St. Gregory

the Great to the effect that Trajan was delivered from hell, admitted that it is possible that God, after a certain time, could put a deceased person in a new situation of testing in which he could merit. In such cases, says St. Thomas, the soul had not been condemned to hell definitively.[103] That is why, according to Bartmann at least, Pope Benedict XII was careful to use the expression *"secundum Dei ordinationem communem'* (according to God's ordinary law) when referring to those who are deserving of hell because they died in mortal sin.'[104]

Other theologians, although they judge as false or doubtful numerous accounts by medieval authors on the liberation of souls from the punishments of hell,[105] nevertheless are willing to accept as authentic certain ancient testimonies from the lives of St. Gregory the Great, St. Silvenus, Sulpicius Severus, St. Martin of Tours, St. Maximin and St. Agnes, as well as more recent testimonies from the lives of the saints, such as St. Francis Xavier. To justify their position, they maintain that certain condemned souls have been preserved from hell through the prayers of the saints and they were therefore exempted from the ordinary law.[100] And having admitted that some departed souls worthy of eternal damnation were snatched from hell by the prayers of the saints, these theologians conclude that the same effect can be attained through the intervention of the Blessed Virgin. As St. Anselm says to Mary: "No one will petition if you are silent; all will petition if you intercede." [107]

On a question so serious and so beset with difficulties, both theological and historical, it seems better to say that perhaps in some cases there was only apparent death and not true death (Trombelli and Terrien),[108] and in other cases there was a temporary and extraordinary separation of soul and body, by an extraordinary act of providence, and that since the souls were to return to this life, they were not the object of God's judicial sentence.[10']

As regards the souls of those who have been condemned to hell by God's judgment, some few theologians, after due precaution, have maintained that some of these souls have been taken from hell, where they suffered for a long time, and returned to life to do penance. This was effected, they say, by a conditioned decree by God; namely, that they were to remain in hell unless Mary interceded for them, or they were consigned to hell for a definite period until

Mary obtained their release.[110] But this opinion is not based on any historical fact whatever and it also is contrary to sound theology.

There is no historical or authentic fact to prove that any souls actually condemned to hell have ever left it through the prayers of the saints or of the Blessed Virgin. Neither is it possible that those confined to hell could ever leave it, nor is there any reason whatever to break the bonds which the immutable sentence of the most just Judge have established as indissoluble and eternal, lire punishments of hell are eternal, and the person sentenced there is there forever. For this we have the testimony of St. Gregory the Great, St. Hilary of Poitiers and St. Bernard.''' Further, at Matins, in the Office of the Dead, the Church in her sacred liturgy chants: "Because in hell there is no redemption, have mercy on me, O God, and save me."

t h e s i s : It *cannot be admitted that the essential punishment* of *the damned can be alleviated at any time through Mary's intercession.*

Previous Observations. The pains of hell could be alleviated improperly and properly. St. Thomas, and with him many theologians, admits alleviation of the pains of hell in an improper sense, so far as God, on establishing the due punishment for the sin, may punish a soul less than it deserves. "Even in the damnation of the reprobate, mercy is seen, which, though it does not totally remit, yet somewhat alleviates, in punishing short of what is deserved." [112] St. Francis de Sales, in his Treatise on *the Love of God* (IV, c. i), says that even eternal punishment is less than one's sins deserve. This improper alleviation or mitigation must be attributed in the first place to divine mercy, and secondly to the intercession and patronage of Mary.[1]''

But we are treating of the alleviation of the punishments of hell in the proper sense, so far as it denotes a mitigation or reduction of the punishment which God, as a just Judge and avenger of sin, has decreed for a soul for all eternity. Alleviation can refer to the punishment due to unforgiven venial sins, to venial and mortal sins which have been forgiven in regard to the guilt but not expiated with regard to the punishment, or to mortal sins which were not forgiven before death. Tlie punishment due to venial and mortal sins already forgiven

is in a certain way, accidental; the punishment due to unforgiven mortal sin is essential. It is possible that venial or mortal sin already forgiven in life with regard to the sin, could be punished in hell by a temporal and not an eternal punishment. If this were so, when the punishment for those sins is completed, the suffering of the damned would be lessened. However, St. Thomas is opposed to this opinion, for he says that the punishments due to unforgiven venial sin and to mortal and venial sins which are forgiven only in regard to the guilt, must last forever, not by reason of the sins themselves, but by reason of the condition of the subject. The soul in hell lacks grace and charity, and is therefore an enemy of God. As such, it cannot obtain that the offering of its suffering be acceptable to God either by way of satisfaction or compensation. Hence, the punishment, though of itself temporal, becomes eternal by reason of the state of the reprobate as "a wound on the arm of a corpse will never heal, not because the wound is mortal, but because it is inflicted on a dead body." 174 Therefore, the question concerns essential punishment, or that which is due to unforgiven mortal sin.

Errors. In ancient times an opinion was held on this question and it has always had defenders throughout the centuries. In the time of St. Augustine, as he himself states, some maintained that the eternal fire would bum only those who by their sins had not performed the required acts of chant}', in conformity with what St. James says in his Epistle (2:13): "For judgment is without mercy to him who has not shown mercy." Therefore, he who had mercy, although he did not correct his evil ways, but lived perversely in the midst of his acts of charity, will be judged with mercy, so that he will not be completely damned or, after some time, he will be freed from ultimate condemnation.175

Some Scholastics, like Gilbert de la Porrée, whom St. Thomas cites,178 maintain that a successive alleviation of the pains of hell is possible through the suffrages of the faithful. Petau also inclines to this opinion, at least to the extent that he says that one cannot, without rashness, condemn this opinion, upon which nothing certain has been decreed by the Church, although it is far from the common belief of the faithful.177 Emery and Ventura do not differ much from this opinion.178 Finally, in our days, Getino defended alleviation of

the pain of sense so strongly that in some of the condemned he reduced it to a minimum, and in others he extinguished it almost entirely.1'·

This opinion on the alleviation of the pain of hell, if it defends a progressive diminution of punishment in such a way that at some time the punishment will be extinguished or something similar, is heretical. If it defends the successive diminution through a certain fixed and universal law, so that the punishment is always reduced without end, it is false, rash, and scandalous. Finally, if it be said that through the divine mercy the lot of the damned is made more bearable, either at fixed times, as in the commemoration of the Resurrection of our Lord (as was held by Prudentius 180), or through the suffrages offered in the Church, or successively through the divine goodness, then this teaching cannot be tolerated.181

Sacred Scripture. We read in the Apocalypse (14:11): "And the smoke of their torments goes up forever and ever; and they rest neither day nor night, they who have worshipped the beast and its image, and anyone who receives the mark of its name." When the rich man was condemned to hell, he prayed: "Father Abraham, have pity on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame," and Abraham replied: "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime hast received good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now here he is comforted whereas thou art tormented" (Luke 16:24-25). Thus, the rich man, buried in hell, was denied a drop of water to alleviate his torment, and St. John Chrysostom concludes: "Not even with the tip of a finger does anyone give them (the reprobate) relief." 182

The *Fathers.* St. Cyprian says of the torments of the condemned that there is no possible source from which relief can come for their sufferings and that those sufferings will never end.183 St. Augustine asks: "Who would dare to say that the suffering to which one is condemned must be mitigated or must have certain intervals, when that rich man could not obtain even a drop of water?" 184 St. Bernard maintains that the condemned will never know any relief but will be tormented forever in hell, nor will they ever be freed from that place where the tormentor never wearies and the tormented never dies.185

The *Practice of the Church.* Tire Church has never been accus-

tomed to pray for the damned nor to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass for them. As St. Augustine points out, Mass is offered for the members of the mystical body.'8"

The Theologians. It should be sufficient to cite the following words of St. Thomas: "Wherefore their punishment cannot be diminished as neither can the glory of the saints be increased as to the essential reward." 187

Theological Argument. Any assistance from Mary which would alleviate the torments of the damned would be in opposition to their impenitence and to the ordination of the divine will, which is all-merciful but also infinitely just.

Secondly, none of the punishment for sin can be remitted as long as the guilt remains. So, St. Thomas states: "Whereas the just, while in the flesh, look to God as the end of all their deeds and desires, the wicked look to an unlawful end which turns them away from God. Now the separated souls of the just will adhere unchangeably to God as the end to which they looked in this life. Therefore the souls of the wicked will adhere unchangeably to the end which they have chosen for themselves. Hence, as the will of the just will be unchangeable to evil, so the will of the wicked will be unchangeable to the good." 188

Lastly, the works of God are ordained and accommodated to the condition of things and of men. There is a time of mercy and a time of justice. The former ends with earthly life, together with the graces with which God calls sinners to repentance; the latter follows immediately. Thus, St. John Chrysostom says that God is gracious, but He is also a most just Judge. He pardons sinners, but He also rewards each one according to his works. He overlooks iniquity and erases sins, but He also examines them. How can these two contrary things be reconciled? They are not contraries if we separate them by time. Here, He pardons sin through baptism and penance; there, He punishes them by torments and flames.18B

t h e s i s: *Whether Mary intercedes for all wayfarers.*

While men live on earth, they may find themselves in different states: in grace, in sin, in heresy, in schism and in infidelity. It is certain that Mary intercedes *for* all men in general, because all men who have the use of reason are given the grace, either proximately

or remotely, which is sufficient for salvation. Thus, it is evident that Marj' cooperates by interceding in the granting of all graces, But it is fitting to study this question in a more special way, treating each of those states separately.

That Mary intercedes for the just and helps them as their Mother is taught by St. Bernard, Conrad of Saxony, Cardinal Hugo and others. "She knows with certitude," says St. Bernard, "and she loves those who love her, and she is very close to those who invoke her, especially if she sees that they resemble her in chastity and humility, to which they unite charity." 100

As regards Mary's merciful intercession for sinners, St. Ephrem addresses her as "patroness of sinners," and St. Germanus of Constantinople declares: "Your patronage is greater than the human mind can comprehend. Daily you extend your helping hand to those who are tossed on the deluge of their sins." 101 St. Peter Damian says to Mary: "You make the rebel yield; you attract the obstinate; your tenderness does not reject the delinquent; because your most pure virginity gave birth to the Author of merciful life." 192

Theophilus Raynaud: "The Blessed Virgin has as her enemies all who are enemies of her Son. . . . Therefore, all those are enemies of the Mother of God who rebel against Christ, who violate His law, all sinners. All, nevertheless, experience the immense goodness and charity of the Mother of Cod when, through her intercession, she asks pardon for them and they are delivered from the eternal ruin which would have befallen them in the world to come. And she does not wait to give her aid only to those who call upon her, but on occasions she anticipates the cries of the wretched because of the impulse of the love with which she is inflamed on our behalf." 103

Cardinal Sfrondato: "Therefore with good reason have I said: The sinner is the very center of Mary, because God created Mary for sinners. She would not even exist if sinners did not exist. Angels, just souls, innocent souls, pardon me if I say that Mary has been given, not to you, but to sinners. Take away sin, and redemption is unnecessary; take away redemption, and the Redeemer departs; take away the Redeemer, and the Mother of the Redeemer would not exist."1M

With regard to sinners, some are ordinary sinners and others are

obstinate sinners. Ordinary sinners arc those who, though deprived of sanctifying grace, have not completely lost the fear of God; obstinate sinners are those who, over and above the privation of grace, have the will to continue sinning, though there still remains in them some possibility of repentance. Obstinacy includes blindness and hardness of heart. Blindness, so far as it is opposed to the illumination of the mind in matters pertaining to salvation, consists not only in the lack of sensibility for perceiving what refers to salvation, but also in the perversion or complete reversal of judgment, of which Isaias speaks: "Woe to you that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter" (5:20). Hardness of heart proceeds from stubbornness of the will which obstinately adheres to sin.

It is a doctrine at least proximate to faith *(proxima fidei)* that ordinary sinners are given, either proximately or remotely, the grace which is sufficient to repent of their sins and return to the way of salvation. With regard to obstinate sinners, it is debated among theologians whether, in punishment for their sin, they are denied all sufficient help for overcoming their hardness *of* heart, or whether, at least, they are sometimes given some supernatural grace, however weak and light. The most severe opinion, defended by Bânez, Gonet and others, denies all help *of* conversion to obstinate sinners; but the common teaching of theologians is that all sinners are given sufficient help so that they can be converted.

Therefore, we can say that Mary's intercession extends to both ordinary and obstinate sinners, but in different ways. For Mary was constituted by Christ crucified as the Mother of all the faithful. As such, she embraces all in her maternal affection, and so great is her kindness that she denies her patronage to no one, not even the most desperate.[108] For that reason, St. Ephrem salutes her as "hope of the despairing" and St. Bernard says that with good reason is she called Queen of mercy, because she opens the abyss *of divine* mercy for whom she wishes, when she wishes and as she wishes, so that not even the greatest of all sinners will perish if he enjoys Mary's patronage.[108]

Theophilus Raynaud remarks that just as the drops of water can eventually wear away a rock, so the heart of stone which has been

hardened by earthly things is gradually broken by the constant and assiduous but gentle promptings with which Mary influences sinners, until in the end they yield.187

That Mary gives her assistance to infidels so that they may arrive at an understanding of the truth and the light of the Gospel is evident from the frequent testimonies of St. Cyril of Alexandria in his homily Contra *Nestorium*.

That Mary likewise intercedes for heretics and schismatics, so that they might return to the unity of the Catholic Church, is taught by St. Germanus of Constantinople.198 Pope Leo XIII, moved by his love for the dissident brethren, fervently exhorts all to pray with all their strength to Mary for the return of the separated churches to the Roman See: "Wherefore, as the nascent Church rightly joined itself in prayer with her as the patroness and most excellent custodian of unity, so in these times is it most opportune to do the same all over the Catholic world." 190 "Every one of the multitudes, therefore, whom the mischief of calamitous events has stolen away from that unity, must be bom again to Christ of that same Mother whom God has endowed with a never failing fertility to bring forth a holy people. And this Mary, for her part, longs to do." 200

Pope Pius XI recommended the same thing when he wrote: "May the Savior, our God, who desires that all men should be saved and arrive at a knowledge of the truth, hear our fervent prayers, that He will deign to call to the unity of the Church all those who have strayed. And in this matter, surely most grave, We have recourse to the Blessed Virgin, Mother of divine grace, conqueror of all heresies and help of Christians, and We desire that recourse be had to her so that soon will come that day, so desired by Us, in which all men will heed the voice of her Divine Son, preserving the unity of spirit under the bond of peace (Eph. 4:3)." 201

t h e s is: Mary *does not intercede equally for all men.*

The model of prayer for Mary is the prayer of Christ. Since Christ did not pray equally for all men, the same must be said for Mary. To pray is nothing other than to express to God one's desire or will so that He will fulfill it, and since Mary's absolute will is always in agreement with that of Christ, the prayers of both must always be in conformity in all things.

Now, Jesus, on the very night of His passion, expressed clearly the entire object of His intercession, speaking thus to the Father: "I have manifested Thy name to the men whom Thou hast given Me out of the world. They were Thine, and Thou hast given them to Me, and they have kept Thy word. . . . I pray for them; not for the world do I pray, but for those whom Thou hast given Me, because they are Thine" (John 17:6-9). "The world" says St. Augustine, "signifies those who live according to the concupiscence of the world."[202]

Why did Christ not pray for the world or why, rather, did He pray in a different way for the world and for the faithful? He had called Himself the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world (John 1:29); He was a propitiation for the sins of all (I John 2:2); He desired that all be saved and come to an understanding of the truth (I Tim. 4:6); and yet He said: "Not for the world do I pray." Maldonatus explains it as follows:

> One could ask why Christ says He does not pray for the world, when a short time afterward He prayed for those who crucified Him, and they certainly were of the world (Luke 23:24). To die requires more intense charity than to pray. It is clear that Christ died and prayed for all, but as the theologians teach that Christ's death may be considered under two aspects, namely, as regards its virtue and power and the antecedent will of Christ and the will of the Father, who sent Him to die, or as regards the fruits and effects which would follow from His death and His efficacious and consequent will, so also it is necessary to distinguish two types of prayer in Christ: that which is sufficient, but not efficacious, and that which is both sufficient and efficacious.
>
> If we consider the death and prayer of Christ in the first sense, it is certain that Christ died and prayed for all, because His death possessed sufficient merit to save all men and His antecedent will was that all should be saved. Therefore, St. Luke says that Christ prayed for all. But if we consider the effect, which does not depend on the will of Christ alone but also on the will of men who must be saved—and not all men desire to receive the benefit of the redemption offered by Christ—not all are saved and neither did Christ pray for all, but for those who would believe.[2]"

So too, Mary, like Christ, though co-redemptrix of all men, does not pray equally for all, but she prays in a manner that is sufficient

for some and is efficacious for others, according as they reject or accept the blessing of redemption, adhere to Christ and have recourse to her as their Mother. So St. Bonaventure says that grace comes to all through Mary in the sense that she intercedes for all, but grace is infused only in those who are disposed to receive it.[204]

Queen and Lady

In addition to the titles and offices of the Blessed Virgin which have been studied in the course of the chapter and which shine forth as so many jewels, no less glorious are the titles of Queen and Lady, the latter signifying that she is Mistress of the whole world. We shall consider the two titles separately.

MARY AS QUEEN

The word *king* is applied to one who rules, meaning one who leads or ordains something to its proper end. Although this can be understood in different ways, only he is a king, properly and formally, who holds the office of ruling a perfect society or of directing the members of a perfect society to the common end of that society. Thus, it follows that the office of king demands an excellence and priority of virtue or a certain primacy over all the members of society. Tire reason for this is that if it is proper to virtue that man's actions be made good by it, then a greater virtue is needed for the performance of a greater good. "The good of the multitude is greater and more divine than the good of one." [205]

Moreover, to rule is to order and to move others toward their end. And if every mover has priority or primacy over that which it moves, then the office of king must possess it over all the members of a society, whom he moves to their end.

By reason of these two qualities proper to the office of ruling, men are accustomed to apply the name of king to those in whom is recognized a greater primacy over others in some respect, such as in art, science, beauty, strength, and so forth. Tirus, the rose is called the

queen of flowers, Virgil is called the king of poets, the lion is called the king of beasts. So the name of king, taken improperly and analogically, is given to anyone who surpasses the rest in virtue or excellence of some kind.

Tire name of *lord* is similar to that of king, although, like the word *master,* it has two distinct meanings. The first signifies the opposite of slavery, so that he is called lord to whom anyone is subject as a slave; the second meaning applies to any relationship of subjection, so that one is called a lord who holds the office of ruling and governing free men. For this reason, St. Thomas says that one man rules another as a slave when he directs or employs that individual for his own personal benefit, but one man rules another as a free man when he directs him to the good proper to the individual or the common good of society.200 In the latter case, the word *lord is* similar to that of king.

The power of governing, proper to the office of king, is a power of jurisdiction, or a power of ruling others as subjects, and it includes legislative, judiciary, and executive power. For the attainment of the social end it is necessary to impose upon a community an obligatory norm so that the associates may obtain that social end through their works, and this pertains to the legislative power. It is necessary to adjust controversies over rights or to declare authoritatively whether or not injury was inflicted, and this is done through the judicial power. Finally, it is necessary to execute all that the laws or sentences of judges command and, if necessary, to use coercion when private individuals do not wish or cannot carry out a command spontaneously and properly, and this is effected by the executive power. The greatest of all these powers is the legislative power, which dominates the other two, and on which the other two depend.

Royal power is of two distinct orders, inasmuch as it tends to secure temporal public prosperity or spiritual and eternal salvation, as the proper end to which men should be directed. The first is temporal or secular power, which is exercised in every kingdom or civil society; the second is spiritual power, which pertains entirely to the spiritual kingdom.

It is evident that Christ, as God, is the universal King, to whom is power and empire forever and ever. As man also He is King, as is testified in both the Old and New Testaments. Thus, in Psalm 2:6

we read: "But I have appointed My king upon Sion, My holy mountain"; and in Daniel (7:13-14): "I beheld therefore in the vision of the night, and lo, one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and he came even to the Ancient of days, and they presented him before Him. And He gave him power, and glory, and a kingdom, and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall sene him. His power is an everlasting power that shall not be destroyed."

In the Gospel of St. Matthew (28:18) Jesus says: "All power in heaven and earth has been given to Me." In the Apocalypse (1:5) Christ is called "faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth," and (19:16): "King of kings and Lord of lords."

Christ is King both by natural and by acquired right. His natural right is based on the hypostatic union. The universal power and dominion which is proper to the nature of the Son of God was conferred on the human nature which was joined to the divine at the moment of the Incarnation. He is also King by acquired right through redemption, since by His blood He freed us from the power of darkness and transferred us into His kingdom (Col. 1:13). However, as Guevara points out, although Christ could have claimed the title of King by natural right, He did not do so until He had shed His blood and thereby gained most perfect merit.[207]

The kingdom of Christ is universal, that is, it is offered to all men of all times. It is a universality which must be understood in its full sense, and not limited by national or social boundaries, nor restricted to any epoch. Not only do all men have a right to enter this kingdom, but they are under obligation to do so. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a witness to all nations; and then will come the end" (Matt. 24:14).

For this reason, too, Christ sent His apostles to preach the gospel to the whole world, as is attested by Matthew (28:18-19); "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to Me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations" and St. Mark (16:15): "Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature." From this command of Christ proceeded the supreme and truly divine right of the apostles, and, therefore, of the Church, freely to preach the gospel to all men. From this same will of Christ arises in all men the obligation, not only of giving His ambassadors the necessary free

dom, but also of accepting the apostolic teaching, under sanction of eternal life and salvation.208

The kingdom of Christ is, in the first place, spiritual and supernatural, and His regal power is exercised primarily by means which are spiritual and supernatural toward goods that are spiritual and supernatural. Christ declared this when He said: "My kingdom is not of this world. . . . This is why I was bom, and why I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth" (John 18:36-37). Indeed, all the offices of Christ are referred to the purpose of the Incarnation, which is the redemption of the human race. And since this end is spiritual, the kingdom of Christ, in conformity to those offices, necessarily has to be spiritual.

Granted this character of the kingdom of Christ, the government of its citizens and their direction to the supernatural end must be both exterior and interior. The interior direction is effected through grace, a gift infused intrinsically in man, by which he is directed to his supernatural end. The exterior direction is given through the objective revelation of supernatural laws by which man is externally directed to his end.

St. Thomas shows clearly that both types of direction are necessary in exercising the office of king in the supernatural order. He states that the end of human law is different from the end of divine law. The end of human law is the temporal tranquillity of the citizens, which the law obtains by directing external actions to prevent those evils which might disturb the peaceful condition of the state. On the other hand, the end *of* the divine law is to lead man to eternal happiness, which end is prevented by sin, not only external, but also internal. Consequently, that which suffices for the perfection of human law, for example, the prohibition and punishment of sin, does not suffice for the perfection of the divine law; but it must make man altogether fit to share in eternal happiness. But this cannot be done except by the grace of the Holy Ghost, by which charity *is* diffused in our hearts (Rom. J:;).208

At first glance it would seem that government or internal direction does not pertain to Christ's kingship, but to His priesthood, because it is through His sacerdotal action that all graces have been acquired. But this does not place the internal direction outside Christ's regal power. Rather, the sacerdotal function serves the royal function, tum-

ing over its fruits to be distributed and sustaining the royal power by the exercise of its power.210

Christ's royal power over things spiritual necessarily includes the indirect power over temporal things when they arc related to the spiritual end and may promote or impede it. St. Thomas says that from the expression of Malachias 1:2 it is clear that Christ's dominion is ordained to the salvation of souls and to spiritual goods, but temporal goods are not excluded.211

It is the common opinion that Christ did not have direct power over the temporal *in actu secundo,* that is, that He did not exercise it. So St. Thomas says that although He was constituted King by God, Christ did not wish while on earth to govern any earthly kingdom temporally.212 Whether Christ had direct power over temporal tilings in *actu primo* has been debated among theologians. St. Robert Bellarmine and Gregory of Valencia deny this power of Christ and quote the authority of Francis de Vitoria, Bartholomew de Medina and others. Molina, Suarez and Lugo hold the affirmative opinion. Actually, the disagreement is for the most part a disagreement of words only.2111

Pope Pius XI, without any distinctions, affirms temporal power in Christ in actu *primo* and denies it in *actu secundo.* He states that it is a mischievous error to refuse to acknowledge that Christ holds an imperium in civil affairs, since the absolute authority over creatures, which He received from the Father, placed all things under His control. He goes on to say that nevertheless, during His earthly existence, Christ wholly abstained from the exercise of this kind of power, and that just as He then disdained the ownership and administration of human things, so he left them and still leaves them in the hands of their possessors.214

That legislative power is particularly becoming to Christ was proved by the Council of Trent when it anathematized those who taught that Christ was not given to men as a legislator who must be obeyed.218 And that, in reality, Christ made laws, is attested in the Gospel: "Keep My commandments" (John 14:15); "teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). Christ made laws in order to establish His kingdom, to endow it with an adequate organism, to determine the conditions for entering it, and

to prescribe all the things by which its citizens are to be led to their supernatural end.

In like manner, judiciary power belongs to Christ, as we see in the work of St. John: "For neither does the Father judge any man, but all judgment He has given to the Son." He first exercises this power at each man's death, and later at the general judgment.

Following this judicial power is His executive power, by which the just are rewarded and the condemned are obliged to suffer their just punishments, according to St. Matthew (25:34-41): "Come, blessed of My Father, take possession of the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . Depart from Me, accursed ones, into everlasting fire" (25:34, 41); and according to the Apocalypse (1:17): "I am the first and the last . . . ; and I have the keys of death and of hell" (1:17).

Taking into account all that has been said, we pass now to study the royal dignity in Mary, in a manner similar to the way we have studied that dignity in Christ. The title of queen signifies in a woman the same thing that the title of king does in a man. She is *properly* and *formally* called queen who is enchargcd with governing a perfect society or of directing the members of a perfect society to a common goal. *Improperly* and *analogically* she is called a queen who, under some aspect, is of greater virtue and has primacy over others. But there is a third meaning, according to which the title of queen is given to the wife or to the mother of the king. Although she does not possess the power of governing as does the king, she nevertheless exercises no small influence in the government of society.

There are three aspects of the present question: in the first place we must study the royal dignity of Mary; in the second, the quality or mode of her royal function; and in the third, the titles or reasons of her royal dignity.

thesis: *Mary should truly be called Queen of all created things.*

Errors. Erasmus maintained that certain praises attributed to Mary were excessive and should not be tolerated; for example, "Hail, Queen, Mother of Mercy." 2|β Luther and his followers also rejected the title of Queen, as well as others given to Mary, for they said that in saluting her by this title, we diminish the glory of Christ, since we

attribute to a creature what belongs to God alone. Calvin follows the same opinion, stating that they are guilty of grave sin who attribute to her those magnificent titles of "Queen of heaven," "Star of salvation," and others. The Virgin herself, says Calvin, rejects them, referring all her glory' to God.2'7 Lastly, the Jansenists denied the name of Queen to Mary, as can be seen in Widenfeldt's virulent writings.21'

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Sixtus IV and Pope Pius IX stated that Mary is Queen of heaven and earth and is exalted above all the angels and saints.210

Pope Leo XIII wrote: "Therefore we behold her taken up from this valley of tears into the heavenly Jerusalem, amid the choirs of angels. And we honor her, glorified above all the saints, crowned with stars by her divine Son, and seated at His side, the sovereign Queen of the universe." 220

St. Pius X said that Christ sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high (Heb. 1:3), and Mary sits at His right hand as Queen.221

Addressing a group of pilgrims from Genoa on April *22,* 1940, Pope Pius XII declared: "This is the hour of the power, the mercy and the grace of Mary. In her is our hope; in her is our peace. Over the earth passes the cloud tinted with the color of death, but the protection and intercession of the Queen of peace and mercy is able to have such influence on the decision of God as to dissipate the clouds and move the hearts of men."

The *Fathers and Theologians.* St. Ephrem calls her "the inviolate Mother of God, Queen of all things, more honorable than the cherubim." 222

St. Germanus of Constantinople addresses Mary upon her entrance into the Temple in the following words: "Be seated, Lady. Since you are Queen, and more glorious than all the kings of earth, it is an honor due you to occupy such a lofty place. . . . Therefore, because of your merits 1 offer you, as Queen of all, the first scat." 223

To celebrate Mary's dormition, St. Andrew of Crete says that God transferred from earth to heaven His ever-virgin Mother, in whose womb He assumed human nature, and made her the Queen of the entire human race.22*

St. John Damascene addresses Mary as follows: "Your soul did not descend into the infernal regions nor did your body undergo corruption. Your immaculate body, free of all stain, was not left on earth,

but was taken to the heavenly mansions, where you rule as Queen, Sovereign, Lady and true Mother of God.[228]

St. Tarasius, St. Theodorus, St. Peter Damian and Rupert of Deutz also specifically refer to Mary as Queen.[22']

St. Bernard writes: "See the Queen, with the crown with which her Son has encircled her brow .... a crown of twelve stars, that is, of those prerogatives by which our Queen shines resplendent above all others."[227]

According to St. Albert the Great, there is a kind of equality of power between Christ and Mary, because she is Queen over the same kingdom of which He is King.[228]

St. Thomas Aquinas states that Mary is Queen and Mother of the King and is clothed in gold, that is, she is gilded with divinity. Not because she is God, but because she is the Mother of God.[222]

St. Robert Bellarmine says that since Mary is Queen, she can petition whatever she pleases from her Son the King.[210] St. Peter Canisius hails her as Queen of angels and men, and more sublime than anyone could imagine.[231]

The Liturgy. We need only refer to the frequent expressions to be found in liturgical prayer, in which Mary is saluted by the title of Queen: "Queen of heaven rejoice, Alleluia"; "Hail, holy Queen"; "Queen of angels"; "Queen of patriarchs, ... of prophets, ... of all saints."

Theological Argument. Christ's royal dignity is in no way obscured because Mary bears the name of Queen. Jesus Christ is the universal King but Mary is universal Queen in subordination to Him, from whom she possesses her participated royal power. As the Mother of the God-Man, Mary belongs to the hypostatic order and thus shares the dignity of her Son's kingship. Mary is therefore truly a Queen, saving always the eminence proper to Christ the King and the incomparable honor due Him as Redeemer and Lord of all.

t h e s i s : *Mary is also Queen in an improper and analogical sense.*

The name of queen is sometimes taken to signify excellence over others in some quality. Now, Mary surpasses all angelic and human creatures, by being superior to them in her excellence of ministry, degree, sanctity and merit, and for that reason she is called Queen of angels, of patriarchs, of prophets, of apostles, of martyrs, of confes-

sors, of virgins and of all saints. Thus, Conrad of Saxony describes her as superior to the blessed in grace.282

It seems that St. Bernard and St. Ildephonse must be understood in this sense when they applied the title of Queen of humility to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Their words present Mary as preferred and exalted above all creatures because of her humility, which means that she is Queen by reason of excellency rather than power.2''

t h e s i s: *Mary is Queen because she is the Mother of the King.*

The Fathers and Doctors. St. Ildephonse says: "I am thy servant because your Son is the Lord; you are my Lady because you are the handmaid of my Lord; I am the servant of the slave of my Ixrd because you, O my Lady, are Mother of your Lord." 284

St. John Damascene states that Mary was constituted Queen of all creation when she became Mother of the Creator; 235 Arnold of Chartres teaches that the Mother cannot be separated from the power and dominion of the Son.238 "She is in heaven the Queen of the kingdoms of earth and the Queen of saints," says Rupert of Deutz, "because she is the Mother of the King." 237

According to St. Bernardine of Siena, by reason of her consent to the divine maternity, Mary obtained the right to be called Queen, and this because of her Son, the King of kings.238

St. Alphonsus Liguori says: "As the glorious Virgin Mary has been raised to the dignity of Mother of the King of kings, it is not without reason that the Church honors her, and wishes her to be honored by all, with the glorious title of Queen.''230

Theological Argument. Mary is the Mother of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As God and man, Jesus is King. Therefore, Mary is Queen or Mother of the King.

That Mary is Queen so far as she is the Mother of Jesus Christ, who is King according to His divine nature, must be understood precisely in relation to the *suppositum* or person, because Mary's maternity terminates in the person of the Son, who subsists in the divine nature. Therefore, Mary is called Mother of the Creator. That she is Queen as Mother of Jesus Christ, who is also King so far as He is man, must be understood not only by reason of the *suppositum,* but likewise by reason of His human nature, which subsists in the person

of the Word and which she conceived in a physical and formal manner.[240]

Hence, Mary is Queen more fully and perfectly by being the Mother of Christ the King so far as He is man rather than as God, since by consenting to the Incarnation, she also consented to her Son's being King as man, and the most pure flesh that Mary gave was the royal purple of Christ the King, according to St. Epiphanius, St. Andrew of Crete and Hugh of St. Victor.[241]

t h e s i s : *Mary is Queen in the proper and formal sense.*

One is called queen properly and formally when, like the king, she has the power of governing or of directing the people of a perfect society to its end, a society which, in this case is none other than the kingdom of Christ. As St. Albert the Great says: "From the same reign and kingdom from which the Son took the name of King, she took the name of Queen." [242] Now, Mary was commissioned to govern the kingdom of Christ or direct its members to their supernatural end. Therefore, she is properly and formally Queen.

The government of the kingdom of Christ, as has been stated, is twofold: exterior and interior. Mary governs the kingdom in both ways.

i) *Exteriorly.* External government consists in the exterior proposition or objective revelation *of* supernatural laws by which the citizens of Christ's kingdom are directed to the attainment of eternal salvation. Although it is not proper to the Blessed Virgin to propose laws by which men tend to the common goal of eternal life, she nevertheless participates in a certain way in this external rule, either by instructing the apostles concerning the revealed mysteries or, by the example of her virtue, showing all the way to perfection and salvation, as expressed by St. Ambrose: "Such was Mary, that her life is an example for all." [248]

2) *Interiorly.* Internal government, which in the kingdom of Christ is the principal government, consists in the influx of supernatural grace. St. Thomas says that the New Law is chiefly the grace itself of the Holy Ghost, which is given to those who believe in Christ.[244] By means *of* grace they fulfill the law and work in such a way and with such efficacy that they attain their goal of eternal life.

Mar}', united to Christ and subordinate to Him, is charged with dispensing to men all graces, and in this way to lead them to eternal life. Therefore, she directs the kingdom of Christ interiorly.21'

Although it is proper to Mary to distribute graces to mankind, inasmuch as she is mediatrix of graces, or patroness and advocate of the human race, nevertheless, this distribution actually constitutes a regal function and an act of governing. Mary obtains these graces through her intercession, but in so singular a way that her intercession is in perfect accord with her regal power and right. By reason of her divine maternity and her association in redemption, she enjoys such power of intercession that, with dependence on Christ, she truly dispenses the graces of redemption. Thus, St. Pius X stated that Mary is the principal dispenser of graces and she is so by maternal right.24·

t h e s i s: *Mary's power in the kingdom of Christ.*

The power of governing which pertains to the office of king is a power of jurisdiction, which includes legislative, judicial and executive power. The first of the three is essential to the royal office; the other two do not pertain to its essence, but they complete and perfect it.

Moreover, the royal power pertains to two different orders: public temporal prosperity or eternal salvation. The first is exercised in earthly kingdoms or civil society; the second has the kingdom of souls as its sphere of action.

Mary participates in the legislative power of the kingdom of Christ, according to the explanation previously given. But neither the judicial nor the executive powers of Christ's kingdom belong to Mar)'. Apart from the common power which St. Thomas attributes to some saints or more perfect souls at the general judgment, Mary has no other special judicial power.247 The Fathers and theologians expressly deny such power of Mary.

In tire opinion of all, Mary is not the Queen of justice, but the Queen of mercy. As St. Ephrem and St. Bernard say, she is the hope of those who despair and even tire worst sinner need not give up hope.248

Authors frequently represent Mary as having obtained half the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of mercy, in which she has her principality; her Son retains tire other half, that is, the kingdom of

justice, in which He exercises His power as judge.[14]' The Jansenists censure this representation as immoderate, as can be seen in Widenfeldt's statement in his *Monita.*[280]

The Fathers and theologians do not, however, establish such a division between justice and mercy that Christ would be no more than a severe judge and avenger, while Mary is the Mother of mercy. For Christ is our Mediator (John 2:1), and as such He has mercy on sinners. He is the source and origin of all pity and mercy, from whom is derived, in its entirety, all of Mary's mercy. It was Christ's mercy that gave us a Mother whose proper function was to exercise mercy towards all.

Christ is infinitely merciful, but according to the Acts of the Apostles: "He it is who has been appointed by God to be judge of the living and of the dead" (10:42). St. John says: "For neither does the Father judge any man, but all judgment He has given to the Son" (5:22); "and He has granted Him power to render judgment, because He is Son of Man" (v. 27).

Hence the difference between Christ and Mary; Christ is infinitely merciful and clement, but as Judge of the living and the dead, it belongs to Him to know and discern the merits of each and, according to the diversity of those merits, to punish or reward. To Mary, on the other hand, it is not given to judge, nor to discern, nor to weigh merits, nor to punish anyone, but rather to protect them and to obtain mercy for them. This is the basis of the famous words of Eadmer, a disciple of St. Anselm of Canterbury: "Sometimes salvation is obtained more readily by invoking the name of Mary than by invoking that of her Son. . . . Her Son is Lord and Judge of all, and knows the merits of each one; and therefore if he does not immediately grant the prayers of those who invoke Him, He acts out of justice. When, however, the Mother's name is invoked, though the merits of the suppliant are not such as to deserve that his prayer should be granted, the merits of the Mother intervene that he may be heard."[281]

Mary's royal dignity, being spiritual and exercised in the kingdom of Christ, directly touches grace and spiritual goods which pertain to salvation. Indirectly it touches temporal favors, inasmuch as they refer in some way to the spiritual end. However, direct power over temporal favors, although attributed to her by right and *in actu*

primo, are not exercised *in actu secundo,* as is true of Christ, of whom we read: "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36).

t h e s i s : *The titles on which Marys royal dignity and power are based.*

Theologians propose many titles on which to base Mary's royal dignity, though all arc not equally solid and firm. Thus, St. Anselm, or rather Eadmer, bases Mary's right on her dignity as bride of the Holy Spirit. He asserts that the Holy Spirit chose her as His spouse and reposed in her through a grace of singular predilection which surpassed all creation in heaven or on earth, thereby constituting her the Queen of heaven and earth and all things contained therein.[353]

Theologians who follow this opinion argue as follows: All the codes of law prescribe that goods be common to both spouses and that both enjoy the same privileges. From this common possession and use of goods and honors it follows that Mary, as bride of the Holy Spirit, has power and dominion over all things.

But this argument is insufficient for proving Mary's royal dignity and supreme power over all. The Blessed Virgin cannot be called the bride of the Holy Spirit in a proper sense, but only by reason of a certain likeness. Therefore, neither can she be called Queen in a proper sense, but only improperly and by analogy.

To be Queen in a true and proper sense, Mary's royal power and rights must be based on her dignity as Mother. Thus, Lcpicier argues that what is attributed to Christ as the natural Son of God must be attributed to Mary as the natural Mother of Christ and the firstborn daughter of God by adoption. By right of inheritance Christ is supreme King of angels and men, and therefore Mary also is by right the Queen of angels and men.[283]

According to Hugon, as the Mother of God, Mary enjoys the same rights and inheritance as her Son, and since the Son is King of angels and the entire universe, Mary is Queen of angels and Lady of the whole world.[284]

SAlazar admits a difficulty in this type of argumentation because normally honor and dignity descend from the parents to the children and not from children to parents. Nevertheless, he says that he is convinced that by natural right the honor and dignity of children sometimes are transmitted to the parents.[288] Gruyter, however, strives

to weaken the entire argument by maintaining that under no circumstances is the mother the recipient of the patrimony and inheritance of the child.26"

On the other hand, Carau wisely remarks that it is not necessary to judge this question by the dictates of civil laws, but it must be settled by natural and even by divine right. The Son of Mary cannot be obligated by human laws in regard to the favors He bestows on His Mother. He was able to constitute her as Queen, He desired to do so, and therefore there is no reason for saying that He did not do so.267

With good reason docs St. John Damascene say: "It was fitting that God's Mother should possess what belongs to her Son, and that she be honored by every creature as the Mother and as Handmaid of God, for although the inheritance always passes from parents to children, nevertheless, to use the words of a wise man, 'The fountains of sacred rivers direct their cunent upward.' "288

Another title of Mary's royal dignity is that of acquisition through her association with Christ in the work of human redemption. Just as Christ, by the title of redemption, made His own the kingdom won by His blood, so also Mary, spouse and consort of her Redeemer-Son in the work of redemption, presides over the same kingdom, and while she did not win it by her blood, as did her Son, she did so by her soul, which was transpierced by the sword of sorrow. St. Albert the Great and Sudrcz used this title as a basis for Mary's queenship.28·

Two titles, therefore—that *of* Mary's divine maternity and that of her association in redemption—are the foundation of her royal dignity. Her divine maternity is the radical and remote foundation; her association with Christ in redemption is the proximate foundation. Merkelbach says that Mary has a radical right to the kingdom by the fact of her divine motherhood, but the divine plan was such that she should merit it also by her union and compassion with her suffering Son, and that she should not exercise it fully until she was united with her Son in heaven and constituted Queen of the entire world.280

MARY AS OUR LADY AND MISTRESS OF THE UNIVERSE

The name of lord or master can be taken in three senses. Properly and strictly, it is the opposite of slavery', and thus one is called lord or master to whom someone is subject as a slave. Less strictly, or in a general sense, lord or master may be used in contradistinction to a subject whom the lord or master directs to the particular good of the individual and also to the common good. So St. Thomas says that one man directs another as his slave when he uses him for his own utility as master, but one man directs another as a free man by directing him either toward his individual good as a free man or to the common good.[201] Therefore, if dominion is taken in a less strict sense, as referring to the direction of others to the common good, it is equivalent to royal power or kingly right, and the lord or master is the same as king.

But if dominion is taken in the strict sense, it differs greatly from kingly power. Kingly right is nothing other than the jurisdiction or power of ruling subjects in relation to the common good, which does not carry with it dominion over objects and persons subject to said power. The king is not lord and master of the house or of the property possessed by the subject, nor are the subjects slaves of the king, but vassals.

Finally, the third meaning of lord or master is an improper sense and it signifies majesty and excellency over others.

It is *de fide* that Christ, as God, is supreme and absolute Lord and Master of all things. The Vatican Council calls Him Lord of heaven and earth.[202] Sacred Scripture speaks frequently of God's supreme dominion: "The heavens are Thine, the earth is Thine; the world and everything in it, Thou hast founded" (Ps. 88:12); "O Lord, I am Thy servant, I am Thy servant, the son of Thy handmaid" (Ps. 115:7); "King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Tim. 6:15). As Creator of die universe, God has complete dominion over all things, including men and their property.

Sacred Scripture likewise affirms that Christ as Man is Lord and Master of all things: In St. Matthew (10:24-25) we read: "No disciple is above his teacher, nor is the servant above his master. It is

enough for the disciple to be like his teacher, and for the servant to be like his master" (Matt. 10:24-25); "You call Me Master and Lord, and you say well, for so I am" (John 13:13); "All things are subject to Him" (Cor. 15:27); "He sent His word to the children of Israel, preaching peace through Jesus Christ (who is Lord of all)" (Acts 10:36). And certainly the Son of Cod, even as man, shares the sovereign power of the Father: "All things that the Father has are Mine" (John 16:15). Tlie right and power which the Son of God has from the Father for all eternity, Christ received in time through the hypostatic union, for if He is rightly called God, He is also rightly called Lord and Master.[203] Reasonably, then, did Pope Pius XI say that it is a mischievous error to refuse to acknowledge that Christ holds an imperium in civil affairs, because He has received from the Father an absolute authority over all created things and all are subject to His judgment and power.[204]

This doctrine established, we pass on to a study of the dominion which pertains to Mary, in which question two things have to be established: the title of Lady or Mistress as applied to Mary, and the type of dominion she enjoys.

t h e s i s : Mary *is rightly called Lady or Mistress of the entire universe.*

The Fathers and Theologians. St. Ephrem frequently addresses Mary as Lady of all and universal salvation of Christians.[200] St. Germanus of Constantinople calls her Lady of all men,[200] and St. John Damascene states that she is rightly called Mother of God and Lady and that she who is at once handmaid and mother has dominion over all creation.[207]

St. Ildephonsc exclaims: "I am your slave because your Son is my Lord. You are my Lady because you are the handmaid of my Lord."[208] Similar statements can be found in the writings of St. Anselm, St. Bernard and St. Bonaventure.[208]

Theological Argument. Tlie title of Mistress or Lady as applied to Mary is by no means opposed to the supreme dominion over all things which belongs to God alone, since we do not attribute to Mary a dominion of absolute and supreme excellence, but only a secondary and subordinate one, always dependent upon the dominion of Christ.[270]

thesis : In *what way Mary can be called Lady and Mistress of all creatures.*

Undoubtedly, Mary is Lady and Mistress in an improper sense, because of her great dignity, which is in a certain sense infinite; because she is superior to all creatures and inferior only to God; and because of her power before God, which theologians call omnipotent.

She is also Lady and Mistress in a less strict sense, because in this sense lord is the same as king, and lady or mistress is equivalent to queen. But we have already seen that Mary is Queen.

In this question, then, we are considering dominion in a proper and strict sense, and distinct from kingly right; that is, we are considering the dominion of ownership. In the first place, it is necessary to distinguish between persons and things. We are not concerned here with persons, since the right of ownership over them is reserved to the Creator, the sole author of life and death. But even in regard to the right of ownership over things it is necessary to distinguish, because it is not the same to be lord and master of things as regards their use and nature and to be so only as regards their use. 'Ibe fact is that God alone is Lord and Master of the use and nature of things, since not only can He use them as He wishes, but He can change them and even annihilate them. This dominion is so exclusive of God that it was not had by the humanity of Christ, nor could it be attributed to His humanity.[271]

Some theologians attribute dominion of ownership over all created things to Mary. Among those who defend this opinion arc Vega, Garau, Sedlmayr and, principally, Bartholomew de los Rios, who goes to the excess of saying that the Virgin Mary has a double dominion over us, spiritual and corporal, and consequently she has both a benign dominion, in the sense that she can dispose of each one for the common good and of all regarding the good of each one, and she also has a despotic dominion, so that she can make use of us for her own convenience, since the dominion which resides in the Son passes from Him to the Mother. This type of dominion, defended by the theologians mentioned, belongs to Mary for four reasons: her divine maternity, her office as co-rcdemptrix, her title of spouse of the Holy Spirit and her gift of original justice.[272]

On the basis of her divine maternity, they argue in this way: Christ, our Lord, has the right of ownership over all created things.

Therefore, so does Mary, since any honor and dignity the Son enjoys by nature, redounds to His Mother.2''

On the basis of her office as co-redemptrix they argue that just as Christ, by shedding His blood for men, freed them from the slavery of sin, and is therefore by right their King and Lord, so should Mary, as the Mother of God and consort of Christ in human redemption, possess rights as Mistress and Queen over all men, taking them under her dominion.

Since Mary is spouse of the Holy Spirit, they argue that all the goods of one spouse are common to the other, and both enjoy the same privileges. From this community of goods, Mary acquired dominion over all things.

By reason of her gift of original justice, the theologians state that just as Adam, through original justice, acquired dominion of all creatures, and having lost original justice, lost this dominion, so Mary, conceived in original justice, recovered the lost power and acquired dominion over creatures.

It can readily be admitted that all these titles offer some basis for Mary's dominion and power in the improper and less strict sense, but they do not seem sufficient to establish firmly a dominion in the strict and proper sense. Mary's title as Mother of God is not sufficient as a basis for the strict sense of dominion because, whereas Christ has strict dominion over all creation so far as divinity is subsistent in His human nature, Mary, although the Mother of God, nevertheless remains completely human and a creature. However, we may say that Christ has subjected all things to Mary's dominion so that she is Lady and Mistress of all, but subordinate to His own.

The title of co-redemptrix gives to Mary a *royal* power and it places all the members of the kingdom of Christ under her benign dominion, but it does not give Mary dominion in the strict sense of ownership.

As regards the title of bride of the Holy Spirit, Mary *is* such only by a certain likeness and therefore it is only by a certain likeness that she is Lady and Mistress of the universe.

Lastly, Mary's original justice is not a sufficient basis for strict dominion, for being innocent and all-holy, she enjoyed the same kind of dominion over animals and plants and inanimate objects as did our first parents in the state of original innocence, namely, she ruled

animals by command and had dominion over plants and inanimate objects by using them.[274]

Taking the previous points into account, we may conclude as follows concerning Mary's dominion:

1) The strict right of dominion over all created things does not belong to Mary. However, subordinate to the right of Christ, to whom all is subject, she is and can be called Lady and Mistress of all created things, in and through Him.

2) Moreover, as Mother of God and consort of the Redeemer, she obtained such power through her omnipotent Son, the Redeemer of the human race, that no creature nor any natural power can compare with hers.

3) This admirable power of Mary's reached its maximum excellence when she was crowned in heaven, being manifested especially in her power of working miracles, of overcoming the power of the devil, of defending and governing the whole Church, of reigning over all rational creatures, among whom there is no one, after God, who can compare with her in sublimity and excellence.[275]

Veneration of JAary

*

Cult or veneration is the honor given to a person, in a spirit of submission, by reason of his excellence. It differs from honor as a species from a genus, since honor is the testimony by which we acknowledge another's excellence, while cult adds to honor the submission we render to the excellence of another, considering him superior in some way. Hence, honor can be paid, not only to superiors, but also to equals and inferiors, in whom is found some excellence worthy of being esteemed as such. Cult, on the other hand, is honor paid to a superiority of excellence.

Cult comprises three acts: *an act of the intellect,* which esteems the excellence of another and judges that person worthy of the submission and veneration given him; *an act of the will,* which chooses to submit and to manifest this submission and reverence; and *the act of submission,* which is either *internal,* such as prayer or faith, or *external,* such as a genuflection or an inclination of the head. It is clear that an external act is not truly cult unless it proceeds from an interior affection and is informed by it.

Cult may be religious or civil and political. Civil cult, or respect and consideration, is the honor paid to someone for his dignity and excellence in the purely natural order, by reason of authority, knowledge, social merits, etc., of which we are not treating here. Religious cult is the honor paid to someone for his excellence in the supernatural order. For that reason there are as many kinds of cult as there are species or degrees of excellence. Excellence, in turn, is divided principally into *uncreated* and *created* excellence, and this latter, into common and eminent excellence.

Hence, cult is divided into *latria,* which is the worship due to the uncreated excellence of God; *dulia,* which is given to the saints for their created excellence and is common to all in the order of grace; and *hyperdulia,* which is reserved to a creature superior to all, because

of a most eminent supernatural excellence. Theologians distinguish a twofold hyperdulia: one differs from common dulia only in kind; the other differs in species.'

Although the Greek words *latria* and *dulia* do not differ much in their signification of servitude, the Fathers and theologians always reserved the term of *latria* for the supreme worship given to God alone, and that of *dulia* for the cult of the saints.

The object of cult is twofold: material and formal. The *material object* is that which is honored or venerated; the *formal object* is the reason or motive for which honor is given. Tire principal material object is always a person, because man can submit only to persons. Moreover, it is evident that the material object must be joined in some way with the formal object, for if it did not possess some excellence which would move to veneration, it could not be an object of veneration.

By reason of the various aspects of the bond existing between the material and formal object, cult is further divided into absolute and relative. *Absolute cult* is paid to the person and to everything proper to the person by reason of identity with the person, by reason of some inherent form or by reason of a substantial union. *Relative cult* extends to something connected with the person to whom reverence is paid, such as images which represent the saints, sacred vessels which have contact with holy things, or relics which are either physical parts of saintly persons or objects which have come in contact with saints during their lifetime.

We shall study first the lawfulness and species of veneration due to the person of the Blessed Virgin, then the species of veneration with respect to some of her more noble parts, such as her immaculate heart, and lastly, the veneration of her images and relics.

Lawfulness of Veneration of Mary

t h e s i s : *Mary should be honored with a sacred cult.*

Errors. Erasmus writes with reverence of the Blessed Virgin, and yet he censures veneration of Mary, attributing it to superstition that so many honor her, and maintaining that this cult is injurious to

Christ. He thus prepared the way for Protestants such as Luther, Calvin and their followers. These speak in various ways of the most Blessed Virgin, sometimes exalting her and at other times lessening her dignity. Thus, as Canisius shows, they acknowledge Mary's divine maternity and her perpetual virginity and they praise her as adorned by God with the greatest charisms and as the most excellent of women, blessed by the very angels and by all generations. Nevertheless, they oppose as immoderate and superstitious the cult given her by the Church.2

The neo-Protestants are even more opposed to the veneration given Mary, since in denying the divinity of Christ and His miraculous conception, they logically deny her divine maternity and her virginity and reject her cult completely.3 Nevertheless, not all modem Protestants show themselves such enemies of the Blessed Virgin, for, as Pope Pius XI notes: "At the present time some of the innovators know better the dignity of the Virgin as *Deipara* and are drawn and disposed to reverence and honor her diligently."4 Lastly, the Jansenists are also enemies of the veneration given to Mary, as is evident from the writings of Widenfeldt.

Church Councils. The Council of Nicaea, the Fourth Council of Constantinople and the Council *of* Trent teach that Mary should be honored by a sacred cult. This can be seen in the Tridentine profession of faith and in Pope Alexander VIII's condemnation of the twenty-sixth proposition of the Jansenists, which states that the praise given Mary is vain.8

Sacred Scripture. The angel Gabriel saluted Mary: "Hail, full of grace" (Luke 1:28). Elizabeth greeted her with the words: "Blessed art thou among women. . . . And how have I deserved that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?" (Luke 1:42)· And Mary said of herself: "For, behold, henceforth all generations shall call me blessed" (Luke 1:48).·

The Fathers, Doctors and Theologians. It is common doctrine that Mary is entitled to a special veneration. This doctrine is found explicitly in the writings of St. Epiphanius, St. John Damascene, St. Bernard St. Peter Damian, Fulbert of Chartres, Raymond Jourdain and St. Bernardine of Siena.'

The Liturgy. Both the Eastern and Western liturgies testify to the legitimacy of the Marian cult. We find explicit veneration of Mary

in the liturgy of St. James, that of St. Cyril of Alexandria and that of St. John Chrysostom. As regards the liturgies of the west, we find veneration of Mary in the Ambrosian, Mozarabic and Gallic liturgies, and above all, in the Roman liturgy, which, in the opinion of St. Thomas and others, is due to St. Peter.

The numerous altars and the churches and chapels erected to Mary, honor her under various titles and arc a testimony to the Christian cult in her honor, as arc the countless works of art which have Mary as their theme.

Theological Argument. Religious cult is paid a person for his supernatural excellence. Therefore, it should be given to Mary, because of her surpassing supernatural excellence as the Mother of God and full of grace, and as the consort of Christ the Redeemer in procuring salvation for mankind and promoting the glory of God.

The honor given to Mary neither harms nor diminishes in the least the glory due to God; rather, it augments it, for the honor paid to the Mother redounds to the glory of the Son.[8]

Thus, devotion to the Mother is never separated from that of her Son, and hence the cult of the two cannot be separated. Therefore, if anyone separates Mary from the cult of Christ, he would destroy the order established by God. For that reason, says Diekamp, Marian cult should be enumerated as one of the works of the true Church.[9]

t h e s i s: Mary *should not be honored by latria but hyperdulia.*

Tire first part is *de fide;* the second part is certain doctrine.

Errors. According to the testimony of St. Epiphanius, the Collyridians in Arabia venerated Mary as a goddess, and in her honor they used to offer little rolls or cakes, using an idolatrous rite. This sect was composed almost exclusively of women, and the sacerdotal offices were reserved to them.

Among the Oriental Montanists, those called Marianites and Filomarianites adored Mary as a goddess, according to the opinion of Bishop Maruta and others.

Many Protestants accuse the Catholics of giving Mary a latreutic cult and practicing a kind of "Mariolatry" which is injurious to God and to Christ. Thus, Luther and Melanchthon accused Catholics of their day of supplanting Christ by their excessive devotion to Mary.

Calvin accused Catholics of doing grave injury to Mary by *giving* to her the honor which belongs to Christ.

These attacks of the Protestants on the cult and veneration of the Blessed Virgin were renewed by the Jansenists, who, under the pretext of defending God's honor, objected to the cult of hyperdulia which the Catholics pay her. They admitted Mary's principal prerogatives, but they accused theologians of exaggerating them. The Jansenists were more interested in avoiding excess than in giving Mary the unique veneration which she deserves.

The first part, with regard to the cult of latria, is *de fide;* with regard to relative latria, it is an opinion. The second part, concerning the cult of hyperdulia, is positive doctrine.

First Part. The Fathers. St. Epiphanius, censuring the abuse of the Collyridians, says that Mary should be venerated; but the Father, Son and Holy Spirit should be adored. Although Mary is most holy and most worthy of being honored, she is not entitled to adoration, and no one wishes to adore her.[10]

St. Ambrose teaches that the adoration proper to Christ is not communicable to His Mother. "Mary," he says, "was the temple of God, not the God of the temple; therefore she is deserving only of the veneration due her as the temple."[11]

Theological Argument. Neither absolute nor relative latria are due the Blessed Virgin, lire adoration of absolute latria belongs to God alone. Mary, however excellent her gifts of nature and of grace, is a pure creature. Moreover, she adores God by the worship of latria, and it is not proper to the same subject to give and receive this worship, just as it is impossible for the same person to create and to be created. Hence, St. Thomas says that although the Blessed Virgin is exalted above the angels, she is not equal to God or united to Him in person. And thus we do not say that she is seated at His right hand, but that she assists at His right hand, inasmuch as the honor of her Son redounds to her, not fully, but by participation, since she is the Mother of God but not God.[12]

Nor does relative latria belong to Mary, as it is due to the Cross and to other instruments of our Lord's passion. Although Mary, by reason of her physical contact with Christ, could *theoretically* be honored with this cult, as are the Cross and other instruments of the

Passion, it must not be given *practically,* because of the danger of idolatry. Those who do not have sufficient religious education are not able to distinguish between relative and absolute latria and would easily attribute to Mary a divine excellence. Moreover, the cult of relative latria is given to inanimate and insensible things, which, not having a proper intrinsic excellence, are venerated by reason of an extrinsic and remote excellence: that of the person they represent or to whom they refer in some way. But Mary should be venerated for herself, because of her intrinsic excellence. She would not be rightly venerated if the veneration were based solely on her extrinsic relation to Christ.

Second Part. The Fathers and Doctors. Comparing the Blessed Virgin to numerous other saints, St. Epiphanius says that she is more worthy of praise.13 St. Augustine speaks of her surpassing dignity14 and St. Germanus of Constantinople states that we honor Mary as the Mother of God and we judge her to be superior to all other creatures, visible and invisible.16

St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that as a purely rational creature, Mary should not receive the worship of latria, but since she is the Mother of God, she should receive the worship of dulia, but of a degree far superior to that given to any other creature; therefore, she is not said to receive the worship of dulia, but hyperdulia.18 St. Bonaventure teaches the same doctrine and makes the same distinctions between the worship of dulia and the worship of hyperdulia.17

Denis the Carthusian states: "In the first place we must honor Mary by reason of her dignity of maternity, whereby she is united to the Eternal Father, since she is Mother of the selfsame Son of whom He is Father. By reason of this admirable dignity she is more excellent than any pure creature and she is superior to all as Lady of the angels, Queen of heaven, Mother and Advocate of all men." 18

Theological Argument. Tire more excellent the person, the more excellent the cult that is given to that person. But Mary surpasses all the saints by a threefold excellence, and therefore must be honored with the cult of the most eminent dulia, namely, hyperdulia. The reasons are: Mary incomparably surpasses all creatures in holiness and fullness of grace; Mary is truly and formally the Mother of God, through which dignity she is intimately united to the Eternal Father, possessing with Him, one and the same Son; Mary is Christ's consort

in the work of human redemption, both objective and subjective, which cannot be said of any other saint. From these three excellencies is derived the other title which also demands for her a more excellent cult: Queen of the universe, to whom all creatures owe love, reverence and subjection.

t h e s i s : *The principal motive for giving Mary the cult of hyperdulia.*

Some theologians ascribe as the principal motive of the cult of hyperdulia given to the Virgin, the most excellent holiness which adorns her. Such is the opinion of Vazquez, who states that this is due to Mary more by reason of her sanctity than by reason of her divine maternity.10

Nevertheless, the common teaching of theologians is that the principal title of the cult of hyperdulia given to Mary is her divine maternity. Certainly, the divine maternity is a unique dignity, much higher than all created dignity, whether human or angelic, by which Mary touches on the confines of the divinity, is related by blood with Christ and by affinity to the divine Persons. Moreover, this maternity is in Mary the root of her eminent holiness, of all the graces and privileges bestowed upon her as dispositions and ornaments of this divine maternity.

On the other hand, although Mary's association in redemption is not a necessary consequence of her maternity, Mary was, by the will of God, Christ's consort in that work because she was His Mother, since no one could be more apt for this work than the Mother of the Redeemer.

Finally, the dignity of Queen and Mistress of all creatures, which shines forth in Mary, proceeds from her divine maternity as does the branch from the root. For this reason the Church sings: "Happy art thou, O sacred Virgin Mary, and most worthy of all praise, for out of thee arose the sun of justice, Christ our God";20 and the Sacred Congregation of Rites declared that her cult of hyperdulia is based on her divine maternity.21

t h e s i s : *Whether the cult of hyperdulia differs specifically or only quantitatively from the cult of dulia.*

Theologians express themselves in different ways on this question.

The Wirceburgcnscs maintain that the cult of hyperdulia given to Man' is not a distinct species, but merely a different degree than is that of dulia.22 Letcher defends the specific difference between the two kinds of cult.28

It seems better to distinguish between the various titles by which the cult of hyperdulia befits Mary. If Mary is venerated for her holiness of grace and glory, it must be said that this cult is essentially of the same species as that given the other saints, because the excellence on which it is based is also of the same species and perfects the Blessed Virgin in the same essential manner as it does the other saints. Nevertheless, since Mary's holiness is greater than that in the rest of the saints, the cult that is due to her is superior in degree within the same species.

However, the cult of hyperdulia given Mary by reason of her singular dignity as Mother of God is of a different nature and species than that of dulia or than that of the hyperdulia which is based on the excellence of grace, because the dignity of the divine maternity is specifically distinct from the dignity of sanctifying grace, and refers to a higher order, namely, that of the hypostatic union. For this reason, the cult based on it is different in its species from that which rests on the excellence of the graces and gifts bestowed on Mary in greater abundance than on the other saints.

Lastly, Mary's dignity as consort of the Redeemer and as Queen of the world seems also to demand a cult of hyperdulia which is different not only in degree but also in kind from the dulia common to the saints, because in addition to the close connection of these titles with the divine maternity, Mary's role as consort in Redemption is so singular that it constitutes her the unique co-redemptrix and mediatrix of all graces, and her dignity as Queen is so eminent that she rules with a dominion of eminence, conferred on her by Christ.24

Nevertheless, in practice there is no need for this distinction and separation of titles, for by the selfsame cult that the Mother of God is honored, her holiness and perfection are also honored. The various titles mentioned are so many special reasons which impel us to venerate the eminence of the Mother of God. This, according to Sudrez, is the most perfect way of honoring the Blessed Virgin.25

Devotion to the Immaculate Heart

Having studied the legitimacy and species of Mary*s cult, we next consider the veneration paid to her noblest members, among which her most pure heart is preeminent.

Properly, says St. Thomas, reverence is given to the totality of a subsistent thing,28 and in honoring the person, we honor at the same time his parts. It is licit to give particularly to some parts the honor due to the person, if there is sufficient reason. For example, the Precious Blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ, is adored, as is His most Sacred Heart, which surpasses in excellence all of the other members of His sacred humanity.

t h e s i s : *The Immaculate Heart of Mary should be honored with a special cult.*

Observations. The heart can be understood in three senses: properly and physically, metaphorically, and symbolically. In the physical sense, the heart refers to the organ of the body; in the metaphorical sense, it is the love signified by the metaphor; in the symbolical sense, the physical heart is used as a symbol of love.

Therefore, in the heart taken symbolically, the thing signified is love in general or the whole affective, intimate and moral life; the sign used is the physical or fleshly heart; the basis of the signification is the connection between the physical heart and all the movements of the affective life. It is hardly necessary to note that this connection between the physical heart and the acts of psychological life do not in any way require that the heart be considered the organ proper to the passions.

All those who assert that the seat of the passions is the brain, must admit that the heart is the first to receive the impressions of the affective life, so that there is no movement of passion or of appetitive potency in the brain which is not acknowledged in the heart by a physiological influence of proportionate intensity.27

Cult or veneration can be given to an object in two ways: explicitly and immediately or implicitly and less directly. There is no doubt that the veneration of the Immaculate Heart of Mary implicitly reaches her entire person because we do not venerate her heart as

distinct from the person of Mary. It is not difficult to determine in what way the veneration touches the heart of Mary explicitly and directly.

In the first place, the heart of flesh and the metaphorical heart may be venerated *per se* in private cult, as is that of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, according as the faithful wish to hold one or the other in mind and affection, because both the physical and metaphorical heart pertain to the person of the Virgin, Mother of God, and both share in her exalted dignity.

According to Lebrun, devotion to the heart of Mary cannot have as its object only the physical heart to the exclusion of Mary's love, nor her love to the exclusion of her physical heart. A devotion of this type would not be in conformity with the spirit of the Church nor in accordance with the needs of human nature.[28] For that reason St. John Eudes wanted to unite both hearts and present them to the faithful.[28]

Thus, the total material object, remote and primary, of the cult of the Immaculate Heart is the person of the Mother of God, because, as St. Thomas says, cult is given to the entire subsistent being. Therefore, although veneration is given to the Immaculate Heart explicitly and directly, implicitly it reaches the person of Mary as its ultimate terminus.

The partial material object, proximate and secondary, is the symbolic heart of Mary, that is, the heart of flesh as symbolic of her love for God and men. It should be noted that Mary's heart does not have as exalted a position as the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

The general formal object of this cult is the singular supernatural excellence of the person of Mary. The special formal object is the excellence proper to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, or the perfection of her interior life, and principally of her most fervent charity toward God, Christ and men, including all that she did and suffered for us by reason of this love, and all that she still does for us.

Magisterium of the Popes. In 1805 Pope Pius VII gave permission to many cardinals, archbishops, bishops and religious institutes to celebrate a particular day in honor of the Heart of Mary, using the Mass and Office of Our Lady of the Snows, *mutatis mutandis.* Pope Pius IX approved a proper Office and Mass of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in 1855.

St. Pius X, in the brief for the beatification of John Eudes (April n> 1909), Praiscs his role in spreading the cult of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, and Pope Pius XI placed this servant of God, the first to propagate the liturgical cult of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, among the number of the saints.[30]

Provincial Councils and Bishops. The Provincial Council of Rheims in 1853 quoted St. Bernard to the effect that we need a second mediator with our Mediator and then remarked that in the history of Christian devotion any cult given to Christ was always followed by a similar cult to Mary. Hence, the Council praised those of the clergy who have promoted devotion to the Immaculate Heart, following upon the cult to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.[31]

From the middle of the seventeenth century, many French bishops approved and recommended the books written to explain and defend the cult of the Most Pure Heart of Mary. They also erected confraternities in her honor, which confraternities were approved by the Roman Pontiffs.[32]

Doctors and Theologians. Before the Church had made any definitive proclamations concerning this cult, many theologians advocated the veneration of the Immaculate Heart. Thus, Eadmer states that Mary's pure holiness and the most holy purity of her heart merited for her that she should most worthily be constituted the reparatrix of all the world.[83]

St. Bernard petitions Mary to open the door of her heart to the supplications of the sons of Adam and states that it is not surprising that consolation and mercy have poured forth from her heart, since the great work of mercy predestined by God from all eternity for the redemption of the human race was first realized in her by the Creator.[34]

Richard of St. Lawrence writes as follows of the services performed for us by the heart of Mary: "From the heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary proceeded the faith and consent through which the salvation of the world was inaugurated, and her heart was found worthy, in preference to all other creatures, to receive the only-begotten Son of God when the heart of the Father manifested the Word which came forth from the Father and was received into the womb of the Virgin Mother. So also in her heart and womb were found mercy and truth, when the divine justice gave the kiss of peace of salvation. Moreover,

her heart, always sweet and loving, was filled with suffering beyond compare when she gazed upon her crucified Son, and her soul was filled with compassion by the torment of His passion. Then she was also wounded by our iniquities and shattered by our crimes. In the bowels of her mercy she bore our sufferings and those of her Son, our infirmities and those of her Only-begotten, because then every misery was a sorrow for her sweetest heart (Ecclus. 25).''[88]

Raymond Jourdain extols the heart of Mary by stating that it was inclined to no other love than love of God and that she fulfilled perfectly the divine precept of love of neighbor in God.[30] Similar testimony can be found in the writings of St. Bernardine of Siena, who say's that words of ardent charity issued from Mary's heart as from a fiery furnace of love.[87]

St. Peter Canisius states: "Speaking of the heart of Mary, it should be said that it was so pure that she, before anyone else, pronounced her vow of virginity; and it was humble to the point that although there were other reasons also, it was principally by reason of her humility that she merited to conceive the divine Emmanuel through the Holy Ghost; and it was so fervent that it was inflamed with an incredible love for God and neighbor; and it was, lastly, most faithful in preserving all that Jesus did in His infancy, youth and maturity. [31]

Religious *congregations were* founded in the time of St. John Eudes and principally at the end of the nineteenth century, bearing the name of the Immaculate Heart or the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary'. They had as one of their purposes the establishment and promulgation of devotion to the Immaculate Heart, together with other apostolic works.[30] Among these Congregations of men and women, consecrated particularly to the Heart of Mary, the Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, founded by St. Anthony Claret in the city of Vich (Spain) in 1848, deserve special mention.

Theological Argument. The adequate object of the cult attributed to the Immaculate Heart of Mary is, as we have already said, the symbolic heart, that is, the physical heart of Mary as the symbol of her love, her interior life, and all her purest affections. This heart of Mary is worthy of honor and of special veneration under both aspects, considered physically and symbolically.

The physical heart is intimately united, as has been said, to human

affections and passions, both of the sensitive appetite and the will. Granted this union, although the heart is not the proper organ of the passions, it is, nevertheless, the instrument of love and of the other affections of the psychological life. Therefore, the heart of Mary was also the instrument of love, of sorrow, of compassion and of the other affections with which she cooperated in the work of human redemption. Therefore, those salutary sentiments and affections of the Blessed Virgin deserve special honor and gratitude from men.

Considered symbolically, the heart is the symbol of love and of the whole affective life. As the symbol of her affective life, it embraces all of her interior life, her moral perfection, the treasure of her merits and incomparable virtues, the anguish and affliction she suffered in life, the sorrows, more cruel than death, that she suffered near the Cross of Christ, her temporal and eternal joys and, principally, her intense love of God, of her Son, and of men. Hence, the Immaculate Heart of Mary is the abbreviated expression of all of her most holy affections, especially of her ardent charity toward God and toward her Son and toward men, and of all that she experienced, did and suffered under the impulse of this charity, and still does. Therefore, it must be affirmed that the cult by which we venerate and honor all of those most holy affections of Mary as symbolized and expressed by her most pure Heart, is most becoming to her.

Veneration of Relics of Mary

Relics in general comprise all that remains of the bodies of the saints on earth after they have departed from this life. Some are relics in the strict sense and others in the broad sense.

In the strict sense, the bodies of the saints and any parts of their bodies are relics; for example, the head, the bones, the arms, or those parts that are considered supplements or complements of the human body such as the hair, nails, and so on, and even the humors of the body such as milk, blood, and such.

Relics in the broad sense are all those things which the saints made holy by their contact and use, such as their clothing and other articles

of which they made use, or objects which they touched in life ot which touched their dead bodies. We also include here the instm-ments by which these saints met a martyr's death.

t h e s i s : *Whether there remain on earth relics of the Virgin Mary.*

It is certain that neither Mary's body nor any part of it remain on earth, because shortly after her death, she was raised from the dead and taken gloriously into heaven.

With regard to other relics of Mary, such as supplements or complements of her human body, some churches claim to possess some of these things. Thus, John Ferrandus enumerates all the places where, in his time, any portion of Mary's hair existed. In Rome, for example, the Church of the Holy Cross, St. John Lateran and St. Mary Major claim such relics. Cardinal Baronius relates that Pope Callixtus enclosed some of the Blessed Virgin's hair in the altar consecrated by him in the Church of St. Agnes. Other places mentioned as possessing relics of Mary's hair are Oviedo, Spain, and Annecy, Paris, Triers, Aix, Besançon and St. Omers in France.40

The Protestants deny the authenticity of these relics of Mary's hair and especially deny that such an abundance of her hair could still be in existence. Nevertheless, the primitive Christians carefully collected and preserved the hair and relics of other saints, and doubtless they would have been anxious to gather relics of Mary.

Moreover, as to the amount of Mary's hair, it is not as abundant as has been claimed, because the hair is divided into very small portions.

Concerning relics of Mary's milk, Campana states that many Catholics would prefer to pass over it in silence; yet there is nothing indecorous about it, but it bears the stamp of the miraculous.41

Some churches boast of preserving a portion of the milk of the Virgin; for example, St. Chrysologus and SS. Cosmos and Damian in Rome, Assisi in Italy, Paris, Annecy, Chartres, in France; Toledo, St. Alban's College at Valladolid in Spain, and other places. Concerning these relics, Trombelli says that it is not to be supposed that this milk is in any great quantity, since altogether, it would probably hardly fill a small phial.43

With regard to the nature of this milk, said to be that of Mary, all theologians maintain that it is not truly that of Mary's virginal

breasts, but rather a liquor which issued from some of her miraculous statues' Campana refers to two of these events. One is taken from the *Chronicle* of Tritcmius and occurred at Bingen, near Mente. The statue of the Blessed Virgin had a circle of five precious stones surrounding her bust. Λ certain thief had robbed the four smallest stones, and on attempting to take the fifth, which covered the very breast of the statue, an abundance of milk and blood flowed forth.

The other event is taken from the *Annals* of Baronius and took place near Damascus. There, from a wooden statue of Mary gushed forth a wondrously powerful oil which could cure bodily infirmities. This liquor, named the oil or milk of the Virgin, was taken to different places of the East and West.

Frequently, what is called the milk of the Virgin is none other than a certain material similar to plaster of Paris, or lime, or white marble scraped from the walls of the Grotto of the Virgin in Bethlehem. The tradition or legend of that place relates that the Blessed Virgin, having left Bethlehem to go to Egypt to escape the cruelty of Herod, hid herself in that grotto and, while she was nursing her divine Son, some drops of her milk fell on the large rock of the crypt. Later, small loaves or cakes were made from the fine, white powder of the crypt and given to the sick, particularly to lactating women deficient in milk.43

With regard to relics of her blood, there is no church whatever that claims to have any, since Mary, while on earth, did not shed even the smallest amount of her blood, since she never suffered any illness whatever, nor did she die a violent death as a martyr. Her death was a natural one, though she died of divine love: a death sweet and ecstatic. Therefore, if the Virgin's blood should be mentioned as existing in some place, it would be miraculous blood from statues, among which is the one called Our Lady of the Blood *(La Madonna del Sangue),* in the diocese of Novarino, in Italy. It was crowned with a diadem of gold by Cardinal Joseph Gamba, Archbishop of Turin, on August 5, 1928.

Among the relics of the most Blessed Virgin taken in the broad sense, we must mention chiefly her cincture or belt, her veil, and other articles *of* clothing. The Orientals held Mary's cincture in great veneration. St. Germanus of Constantinople lavished on it most eminent praises, and its feast, which at first was celebrated on a ferial day,

became one of the chief solemnities. The Greek calendar of the Emperor Basil (Urbino edition of 1727, under August 31) states that Arcadius, son of Theodosius the Great, brought the cincture of the Blessed Virgin to Constantinople from Jerusalem, where it had been preserved by a certain virgin, and deposited it for public veneration in an elegant shrine. Four hundred years later, under the Emperor Leo, the patriarch delivered the Empress Zoe from an impure spirit by applying this relic. Eventually it was transferred to the Basilica of Chalcopratum, constructed by Empress Pulcheria.

In the West, the Virgin's cincture was preserved in the Church of St. Mary Major in Rome, where it was supposedly taken from Constantinople when that city was under attack by the Turks. Many other places claim to have a cincture of Mary, or a part of it.

The city of Prato in Tuscany glories in possessing a cincture of the Virgin which is distinct from the one preserved in Constantinople and in any other city, for, according to the tradition of the people of Prato, Mary gave it to St. Thomas the Apostle when she was taken to heaven.

The people of Chartres claim to possess the Blessed Virgin's veil. Oviedo in Spain, and other places claim portions of that veil and other articles of clothing.[44]

Finally, on this subject of relics it is important to keep in mind that there is much doubt concerning the authenticity of many of the relics of the Blessed Virgin. Canon Law states that bishops are not to permit, especially in preaching, books or periodicals destined to arouse piety, that any questions be treated concerning the authenticity of relics, based on merely probable opinions, prejudice and especially in words that savor of ridicule or disrespect (can. 1286).

t h e s i s : *Mary's relics are honored by the cult of hyperdulia, not absolute but relative.*

This is a question of the public cult that the faithful are to give to those relics of the most Blessed Virgin whose authenticity is proved by official documents (can. 1283) or to those which, because they have been venerated since ancient times, should continue to be venerated at the present time, unless they are proved false by conclusive arguments (can. 1285).

Errors. An early opponent of this doctrine of the veneration of

relics was Vigilantius, who was refuted by St. Jerome. Protestants revived this error and strongly opposed the veneration of Mary's relics. They deny the authenticity of such relics and ridicule the piety of the believers, which they qualify as an exaggerated and reprehensible credulity.

First Part. The Council of Trent declared that bishops and all who have the office of teaching should instruct the faithful concerning the lawful use of relics and should affirm that those who maintain that the relics of saints should not be honored or are uselessly honored by the faithful, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already condemned them and now also condemns them.[49]

Canon Law declares that the invocation of the saints is a good and useful practice, as also the veneration of their relics and images (can. 1176).

The Fathers and Theologians. St. Germanus of Constantinople preached an eloquent sermon in which he praised the cincture of the Blessed Virgin and encouraged its veneration.[4]" In the same manner, St. Euthymius of Constantinople likewise paid public tribute to the relic.[47]

Theological Argument. Anyone who professes love for another, usually venerates whatever remains after the death of the loved one.[48] Therefore, any relics of the Blessed Virgin should be fittingly venerated, because she is more worthy of honor than all other saints.

Second Part. Canon Law states that veneration is due to holy images and relics, and relative cult is due the person they represent (can. 1255).

Theological Argument. Relative cult is paid to things not having a proper intrinsic excellence, but rather an extrinsic one, or an excellence existing in the person to whom those things refer. Now, Mary's relics, like all others, possess no intrinsic excellence for being venerated in themselves, but they are venerated by reason of the excellence of the Blessed Virgin. For that reason, St. Thomas, speaking of relics in general, says that we worship the lifeless body, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the soul which was once united to it, and now enjoys God; and for God's sake, whose ministers the saints were.[48]

Veneration of Images of Mary

t h e s i s: *linages of Mary should be venerated.*

An image is a true likeness of that which it represents. It differs from an idol in that the latter is a false likeness of a thing; it represents something which in reality docs not exist. Equivalent to the word idol is the word *simulacrum,* which does not imply a resemblance, but a simulation, which always connotes some falsity.

The image can be considered either as an object or as something representative of its exemplar. Under the first aspect, or insofar as it is an object, such as a statue displayed in a museum, it is clear that neither because of the material of which it is composed (gold, wood, marble, and the like) nor by reason of its artistic form, is it worthy of veneration, even though it may be admirable in itself. Therefore, this question concerns the images of Mary under the second aspect, that is, insofar as they arc formally representative of their prototype.

Errors. The iconoclasts were opposed to the veneration of the images of Mary, of Christ and of the saints; others allowed their use as an adornment for their churches or for the study of history, as is the case of some modern Protestants, although some are even inclined to give a certain reverence to the images of Christ and of the Virgin.

The Councils. The Seventh Ecumenical Council, held at Nicaea, defined that just as crucifixes should be venerated in the churches of God, on sacred vessels and vestments, on walls, in homes and on the streets, so also images of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and of our immaculate Lady, the holy Mother of God, and those of the saints should be venerated.60

The Council of Trent decreed that the images of Christ, of His Virgin Mother, and of other saints arc to be used and retained, in churches especially, and that due honor and veneration be given them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, or that anything is to be asked of them, or that any confidence is to be placed in images, but because the honor which is shown them is refened to the persons they represent; so that in venerating images we adore Christ and venerate His saints, whose likeness they represent.61

Similarly, the Tridentine profession of faith states that the images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin and the other saints are to be retained and to be given due honor.52

The *Codex Juris Canonici* states that it is good and useful to invoke the servants of God and to honor their relics and images, but above all, those of the Blessed Virgin.53

The Fathers. St. Basil says that images are not only not forbidden, but we find them in all our churches.54

St. Gregory the Great commanded the Bishop of Cagliari to remove a crucifix and a statue of the Blessed Virgin from the synagogue, where they had been placed by a converted Jew, so that they could be given the veneration they deserve.55

Writing to Sereno, Bishop of Marseilles, who had removed certain images from the church and had them destroyed, the same St. Gregory stated that while he praised the zeal of Bishop Sereno in preventing possible idolatry, he should not have destroyed the images because those who are uneducated could read in the images what they are unable to read in books.5·

Archeological Investigations. From the earliest days of the Church, images of the saints, especially those of the Blessed Virgin and of the Apostles Peter and Paul, were painted or carved in the underground oratories of the catacombs. This indeed is a sign that religious veneration was given to them. Moreover, many prodigies and favors have occurred throughout the centuries, as *if God* wished to attest how pleasing was the honor paid to the images of Mary.

Theological Argument. It is just and proper that all honorable persons be venerated, not only in themselves, but also in their images. Therefore, Mary's images should be venerated, since her person is most worthy of all honor and veneration.

Moreover, in conformity with the inclination we feel toward any person, whether of love or of hate, of esteem or of contempt, we always react in some way to the images representing that person. But no one could feel so opposed to the Blessed Virgin Mary that he would not give her sacred images some mark of love and religious veneration.

Finally, man is so constituted of body and soul that in the exercise of his intellectual and moral life he needs the assistance of sensible things. Hence, images of Mary, like those of Christ and of the saints,

are most suitable, not only for teaching illiterate people, but also for arousing love and other pious sentiments in all the faithful. For that reason, St. Gregory the Great asked Secundinus to send him an image of the Savior in order to renew his fervor (Ep. 54), and in her Life (c. 9), St. Teresa of Avila testifies that because of a statue of the wounded and scourged Christ which she gazed upon, she was moved to strive for a holier life and to overcome certain habits of imperfection.

Tlie Council of Trent (Sess. XXV) advised bishops to make use of sacred images for instructing the ignorant and inspiring the faithful to the exercise of Christian virtue, in imitation of Christ and the saints (Denz. 987).

t h e s i s: *The kind of cult with which Mary's images are to be venerated.*

It is certain that to Mary's images, as to those of the other saints, we cannot pay absolute cult, or a cult based on the excellence of images themselves, but on that of the prototype, since cult given solely to an image would not extend directly to the person but to the inanimate thing, which of itself is inferior to a rational creature and, therefore, by that very fact, incapable of claiming veneration.

It therefore follows that the veneration due to images must be merely a relative cult, since they are honored only because of the saints they represent, as was decreed by the Second Council of Nicaea: "The honor given to an image passes to that which is represented by it, and he who venerates an image, venerates tlie person represented by the image." 07 The same basic principle was repeated by the Council of Trent (Denz. 986).

The question, therefore, is limited to the following: with what kind of relative cult images of the most Blessed Virgin should be venerated. Or, to put the question another way: whether the same kind of veneration is given to Mary as to the image.

Opinions. Durandus says that holy images are not in themselves worthy of veneration, but merely furnish an occasion to honor the prototype. This opinion is commonly rejected by modem theologians, since die official teaching of the Church is perfectly plain on this

point. According to the teaching of the Councils of Nicaea and Trent, the images of the saints are worthy of lawful veneration.

St. Robert Bellarminc, Catharinus and others held that sacred images were to be venerated for their own sake, but with a lesser or inferior cult than the prototypes, and that the veneration given to the image would pertain to the veneration of the prototype only analogically and reductively. But in reality this inferior cult, as described by the foregoing opinion, would be inexplicable. It could not be absolute, since inanimate beings are incapable of receiving the cult of latria, hyperdulia, or dulia or any other kind. And if it is said to be relative, then the same cult is given to the images as to the prototype, the only difference being that the first is relative and the second is absolute.

Tlie most common opinion holds, with St. Thomas, that the cult given the prototype and the image is of the same species; to the former is given absolute veneration; to the latter, relative. Both taken together comprise the total object of the cult. St. Thomas explains this by saying that the veneration paid to the image as such is one and the same as that which is given to that which is represented by the image.08 In other words, the veneration does not stop at the image but passes to the prototype, so that the image cannot exist or be imagined without the prototype it represents. For that reason the cult we give to an image of the Blessed Virgin and to the Blessed Virgin herself is, specifically and numerically, one and the same cult.0»

Veneration of the Name of Mary

Tlie veneration of the name of Mary is comparable to the veneration of images of Mary because, like an image, her name is also one with the person signified.

t h e s i s: *The name of Mary should be honored with a religious cult.*

Magisterium of the Popes. According to Pope Benedict XIV, the feast of the Most Holy Name of Mary was established with the

approval of Rome in the diocese of Cuenca in Spain. It was suppressed by St. Pius V and restored by Pope Sixtus V, at the request of Cardinal Dcza.®°

Pope Gregory XV extended the feast to the diocese of Toledo in 1662, consenting to the request of King Philip IV.0* In 1671, Pope Clement X extended the Office of the Most Holy Name of Mary, which was already recited in Toledo, to all the Spanish dominions, and granted a plenary indulgence to all the faithful who assisted at the solemn Mass on this feast, which was celebrated in all of Spain on September 17.®2

By his decree of 1683, Pope Innocent XI ordered that the feast of the Most Holy Name of Mary be celebrated yearly in the universal Church, in thanksgiving and in memory of the remarkable victory which, under the protection of the Blessed Virgin, John Sobieski, King of Poland, had obtained against the Turks who besieged Vienna.®3

The *Fathers and Theologians.* St. Peter Chrysologus says: "This name is salvation for those who are reborn, the emblem of virginity, the splendor of purity, the indication of chastity." ®'

St. Peter Damian says that it was from the treasury of the divinity that Mary's admirable name came forth and that through it the redemption was effected.®3

St. Bonaventure states that it is fitting to honor Mary's name with the cult of hyperdulia because even the blessed and the angels venerate it.®®

Raymond Jourdain says: "The whole Trinity gave thee a name, which, after that of thy most holy Son, is above every name, so that at thy name every knee should bend in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and every tongue should confess the grace, the glory and the power of thy most holy name." ®T

Theological Argument. The images of the Blessed Virgin are worthy of veneration because they represent the Blessed Virgin. Therefore, the name of Mary also deserves veneration because it represents the person designated by it. St. Thomas argues that since words are signs of ideas, and ideas are the likeness of things, it is evident that words refer to the things signified through intellectual conception.·8 Hence, names are identical with the things or persons signified.

τIIesis: *The name of Mary is entitled the cult of hyperdulia, not absolute, but relative.*

What pertains to the veneration of images of Mary is applied likewise to her name: it is venerated by reason of its relation to Mary. Therefore, the name of Mary should certainly be honored, not for itself, but for the Virgin Mother of God, which means to venerate it by a relative cult.

thesis: *The power and efficacy of the name of Mary.*

In genera] it must be asserted that the name of Mary is of great value in obtaining innumerable benefits.

St. Germanus of Constantinople says: "As breathing is not only a sign but even a cause of life, so the name *of* Mary, which is constantly found on the lips of God's servants, both proves that they arc truly alive, and at the same time causes and preserves their life, and gives them every succor."69

Conrad of Saxony asks why Mary's name would not be illustrious when her name cannot be devoutly invoked without utility to the one who invokes it.70

St. Peter Canisius says that when the name *of* Mary is referred to her honor and sanctity and is pronounced devoutly, it is profitable to many and has a singular divine power.71

In particular, the following effects are usually produced by the name of Mary:

r) *It causes the demons to flee.*

St. Germanus of Constantinople: "By repulsing and putting to flight the perverse enemy when he attacks thy servants, and this simply through the invocation of thy name, thou dost preserve them intact and secure."72

Conrad of Saxony: "Visible enemies do not fear the greatest armies as much as the invisible powers fear the name of Mary, her protection and her example." 79

a) *It arouses a love of purity.*

St. Albert the Great says that if the flesh is attracted to unlawful pleasures, one can obtain relief through invoking the name of Mary."

3) *It gives a certain spiritual sweetness.*

St. Anthony of Padua: "The name of Mary is joy to the heart honej' to the lips, music to the ears." 75

St. Bernardine of Siena: "By this name the heart is purified, the mind is illumined, the soul is inflamed, the breast is soothed, the taste is sweetened and affection is beautified." 70

4) *It expels fear and comforts the sorrowful.*

St. Germanus of Constantinople: "We receive greater protection from thy name than delight from the gentle breezes."77

Alcuin: "It is impossible, O Mary, to name thee or think of thee without thy vivifying the affection of those who love thee."78

5) *It drives away temptations.*

St. Bernard: "O you, whoever you are, who are tossed on this stormy ocean, raise your eyes to this star if you would escape shipwreck. When the adverse winds of temptation blow, amid shoals, tribulations, pride, ambition, slander, raise your eyes to Mary. If the remembrance of your sins afflicts you, if remorse besets you, if the rigors of the judgment terrify you, despair not; go to Mary. Have her name ever on your lips and in your heart; to obtain her protection, imitate the example of her virtues. Walking in her steps you cannot en; praying to her you arc sure to obtain your petition; thinking of her you will not fail. If Mary' supports you, you shall not fall; if she guides you, you shall reach your heavenly country." 70

Richard of St. Lawrence advises sinners to call upon the name of Mary, and they will be cured of their evil. He advises the just, who fear the snares of the devil, the more if they were once conquered by him, to do the same. "Do not forget that our Lady is a tower of strength; in her the sinner will find refuge in time of temptation, and also he who had formerly sinned."80

t h e s i s: *How the name of Mary produces its effects.*

Some theologians, such as Raymond Jourdain, Novato, Vega, Sedlmayr and Lepicier, state that the name of Mary, when pronounced devoutly, has such efficacy that it produces marvelous effects, not only *ex opere operantis* (through the devotion of the one who pronounces it), but also *ex opere operato* (of itself).81

It is clear that the name of Mary does not have the power to confer grace *ex opere operato,* as do the sacraments. This is admitted by

the aforementioned theologians. Thus, Sedlmayr states that there is a great difference between the efficacy of the names of Jesus and Mary and the efficacy of the sacraments. The sacraments produce sanctifying grace as an immediate effect, but the names of Jesus and Mary produce other effects immediately, but not sanctifying grace, at least not immediately. On the other hand, the sacraments produce their effects infallibly, if there are no obstacles; the names of Jesus and Mary produce their effects fallibly and contingently, on condition that it be pleasing to God and conducive to the salvation of those who invoke them.82

Hence, they conclude that the name of Mary has the power *of* producing the above-mentioned effects *ex opere operato* in the same way that other sacramentals arc able to do so.83 For example, Raymond Jourdain says that the name of Mary is a sacramental *of* divine institution, and whether pronounced or written, it produces amazing effects *quasi ex opere operato.*9* But although the opinion concerning the *ex opere operato* efficacy of the sacramentals has remarkable defenders, it was not supported by the most ancient theologians.*8

Today theologians commonly teach that the sacramentals consisting in blessings by which the things on which they are bestowed are made objectively holy, produce their effect *quasi ex opere operato;* but all the sacramentals which tend to obtain spiritual or temporal benefits for us, produce their effects *ex opere operantis* or by way of impétration, which receives a special power from the prayers of the Church. For a similar reason, it seems that the same should be said of the efficacy of the name of Mary. Therefore, the name of Mary does not have of itself, intrinsically, the necessary force to confer its salutary effects *ex opere operato.*

It is, therefore, sufficient to obtain these effects solely through the invocation of that name, *ex opere operantis,* or by way of impétration, since Mary', on being invoked in this way, is moved to give us her assistance. Merely to pronounce her name devoutly is equal to invoking her, asking her protection and favorably disposing her intercessory power, as if to oblige her to help us.88

Surely, after the name of Jesus, the invocation of the name of Mary is more efficacious than that of the other saints, since it surpasses all the others in excellence, as Richard of St. Lawrence expresses it.87 Consequently, the faithful should be exhorted to invoke

this holy name of Mary so devoutly and unceasingly that in life and in death, as was the pious desire of St. Germanus of Constantinople, the name of Mary, Mother of God, may be the last word on their lips.88

CHAPTER SIX

Elements oj the Cult of EMary

*

The cult of Mary consists of these three characteristics: cult of honor, cult of invocation, and cult of imitation. By the cult of *honor* we recognize and praise Mary's singular excellence; by that of *invocation,* proclaiming her superiority and showing her our reverence, we entreat her as universal mediatrix of graces and our most powerful advocate near the Lord; and we give her the cult of *imitation* because St. Ildephonse of Toledo says that true praise of the heart consists in imitating her virtues.

Cult of Honor

Together with the honor due Mary is included in this article the love which should be professed for her, since love follows goodness and beauty, to which honor always refers.

thesis: *The cult of honor is to be given to Mary.*

We hardly need pause to study the cult of honor due to the Blessed Virgin, because from what has already been said, the honor and veneration she deserves arc more than evident. It should suffice to add that to the cult of Mary belongs all thought, word or work that in some way celebrates her excellence, goodness, beauty and power. Therefore, the cult to be given her includes both internal and external acts. The internal acts include arousing in the soul the highest esteem for Mary; praising in our hearts her lofty dignity as Mother of God, her offices as mediatrix, co-redemptrix. Queen of heaven and earth, and our sweet and most benign Mother, rejoicing in her numberless natural and supernatural gifts; meditating attentively on her privileges; and having an insatiable zeal for spread-

ing her honor everywhere. External acts consist in singing her praises, praying to her, pronouncing her sweetest name, visiting her images and the churches dedicated to her, joining confraternities bearing her name, living under her patronage and paying her other honors. By these and similar pious acts we must unceasingly practice Mary's cult of honor. It should be constant and daily, so that not a day passes without our honoring her by some special praise. St. Albert the Great says that we should honor our Lady and Mother every day of our life.

thesis: *The cult of love is to be given Mary.*

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Leo XIII speaks in this manner: "As often as the occasion arises to stimulate and intensify the love and veneration of the Christian people for Mary, the great Mother of God, We are filled with wondrous satisfaction and joy. . . . For the holy reverence for Mary which we experienced from Our tenderest years, has grown greater and has taken firmer hold of Our advancing age. As time went on, it became more and more evident how deserving of love and honor was she whom God Himself was the first to love, and loved so much more than any other that, after elevating her high above all the rest of His creation and adorning her with His richest gifts, He made her His Mother." [1]

Pope Pins XI writes: "Do they not know or consider attentively that nothing can be more pleasing to Christ Jesus, who certainly loves His Mother with a boundless love, than that we should venerate her, love her ardently, and, by imitating her most holy example, endeavor to obtain her powerful patronage?" [2]

The Fathers and Theologians. St. Ephrem: "O Virgin and Lady, Mother of God! You, surely, do not cease to look on us as Mother, but as a lover of your children, always inclined to love, you bestow on us your gifts, saving us and ever defending us. . . . We give you thanks for all these things; we praise your mercies; we do not keep your benefits hidden; we sing aloud your marvels; we praise your solicitude; we eulogize your providence; we celebrate your assistance by hymns; we recommend your mercy; and as regards the past, recalling your numerous benefits and the many dangers from which you have delivered us, we offer you, as is fitting, this canticle of

thanksgiving which can never equal the benefits you have bestowed on us." [8]

St. Anselm of Canterbury: "You above all others, after your Son, my Lord and God, . . . my heart acknowledges and venerates, loves and implores, not with the degree of love which I, so imperfect, desire, but to the degree that I am able." [4]

"O Jesus, I beg Thee, by the love with which Thou dost love Thy Mother and dost desire that she should be loved, grant that I also may truly love her. O good Mother, I beg thee, by the love with which thou dost love thy Son, . . . grant that I may truly love Him also. . . . May my mind venerate both *of you as you* deserve; may my heart love both of you as is fitting; . . . may I spend my life in your love and service so that my entire being may glorify Jesus and Mary for all eternity." [5]

St. Bernard says: "Let us venerate Mary with all the affection of our hearts, *for* such is the will of God, who is pleased that we should receive every good thing from her hand." [8]

We also have proof of this most devoted love of Mary in the example of the saint. St. Dominic, St. Bernard, St. Philip Neri, St. Bernardine of Siena, St. Aloysius Gonzaga, St. Stanislaus Kostka, St. Alphonsus Rodriguez and many others mentioned by St. Alphonsus Liguori in his *Glories of Mary* (P. I, c. I) were outstanding in their love of Mary and their zeal for promoting her cult.

Theological Argument. There are three incentives for love: goodness, benefits and love. Goodness, because the object of the will is the good, just as that of sight is color; benefits, because even the animals feel thus bound; and love, because one would be hard of heart who would not give love for love, as St. Augustine states in his *Confessions* (Book VIII).

These three things are found abundantly in Mary. Incomparable goodness, through her being the most noble and excellent of creatures, participating in the goodness *of God to a* degree surpassing every other creature, for, as the Mother of God, she touches the confines of divinity, is full of grace and is adorned in soul and body with the most eminent beauty. As to benefits, Mary dispenses and lavishes the treasures of mercy even on the most ungrateful and most unworthy. As to love, in her zeal for their eternal salvation, she

is most diligent in obtaining that, after the miseries of this life, souls may be taken to their heavenly home.

Corollary. To the love professed for Mary, above all, if it is not an inconstant and weak love, but rather a fervent love, there is added *felicitation,* by which we rejoice intimately with Mary in her glory, her holiness, her benefits, and all the ineffable prerogatives bestowed by divine liberality to be the Mother of God and our Mother, co-redemptrix and advocate of the human race and mistress of all creatures; *confidence,* by which we place our strongest hope in Mary, after God, since she not only can, but does wish to help us, being our Mother, co-redemptrix and most benign advocate; *service* or subjection, by which we offer ourselves to Mary, our Queen, Mistress and Mother, as servants and dutiful children, serving at the same time, her Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, thus consecrated to the service of Jesus and Mary.

St. Ildephonse of Toledo expresses this manner of servitude or holy service beautifully by saying: "I shall serve Thy Mother in such a way that Thou shalt believe that thereby I am serving Thee; may she dominate me to such an extent that I shall know I am pleasing to Thee; may her dominion over me be such in this life that I shall have Thee for my Lord in eternity." [7]

Cult of Invocation

t h e s i s: *Mary should be honored by the cult of invocation.*

There are two kinds of invocation: one is proper to the divinity, by which we acknowledge God as the source of all good; the other is intercession, by which we seek aid and assistance in order to obtain more easily what we ask and hope for from God.

It is evident that we are not treating here of invoking the Blessed Virgin in the first sense, because the mind and practice of the Church has always been to direct her prayers to God, the Giver of all good, and has never recognized the Blessed Virgin or any of the other saints as masters and authors of grace. Therefore, invocation of Mary is taken in the second sense, namely, that when moved by our prayers.

she intercedes to God so that He will deign to bestow upon us the favors which we seek.

Errors. Coproninus and Vigilantius rejected the invocation of the Virgin and of the saints as impious, opposed to salvation, and insulting to the divine honor. Protestants generally maintain that the invocation of Mary is injurious to Christ. The Jansenists reject invocation of Mary and reduce her cult to mere imitation.

The Council of Trent. After affirming that the saints in heaven offer their prayers to God for men, the Council states that it is good and profitable to invoke the saints in order to obtain blessings from God through Jesus Christ our Lord and Redeemer and that they are guilty of impiety who deny that the saints are to be invoked, or assert either that they do not pray for men or that to invoke them is idolatry, or that it is against the Word of God and contrary to the honor of Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between God and men, or that it is foolish to pray by word of mouth or mentally to those who reign in heaven.[8]

All of the above has special application to Mary, whom Pope Sixtus V praises as the Mother of mercy, Mother of grace, friend and consoler of the human race, and diligent petitioner of the salvation of the faithful, who are crushed under the weight of their faults.'

The Fathers, Doctors and Theologians. St. Ephrem addresses Mary as follows: "Do not cease to intercede for us, thy unworthy servants; rather, save us from condemnation by thy prayers, which are faithful until the end." [10]

St. Ambrose: "And in order that this prayer of mine may be efficacious, I ask the suffrages of the Blessed Virgin Mary, whom Thou didst make so rich in merits."[11]

St. Bernard: "If the winds of temptations arise, if you are cast on the shoals of tribulations, look at the star, call upon Mary. If you are buffeted by the waves of pride, ambition, detraction, envy, look at the star, call upon Mary." [13]

St. Amadeus: "Let us ask the Mother of pity, by the secret joy's and ineffable loves which she merited through a singular privilege, to bestow on us her affection of maternal piety and to intercede with her Son for pardon of our sins." [18]

The Liturgy. By her authority and example the Church approves

the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and presents countless forms of invocation, noteworthy for their dignity, antiquity and universality, such as the Hail Mary, the Hail, Holy Queen, the litany of the Blessed Virgin, the Rosary, the *Memorare*.

The Custom of the Faithful. Since the earliest times the Christian people have had the custom of invoking Mary. This custom was so universal in the Church, that the faithful in all their necessities, dangers and afflictions always turned to Mary, asking her protection and assistance, as is proved in history by innumerable deeds and examples.

Theological Argument. Intercession and invocation are two correlative concepts. The second follows logically from the first, since it would be inaccurate to think that Mary intercedes for us and obtains for us all kinds of favors, if we could not implore her intercession and ask her assistance. But from all that has been said before, it is evident that the Blessed Virgin is continuously interceding at the throne of God for all men. Therefore, there is nothing more reasonable than the cult of invocation on our part.

Nor does the invocation of Mary obscure the dignity of Christ in any way, but rather enhances it, because the power of Mary thus invoked is like a radiation of the power of Christ. Mary is not invoked as if she were independent of Christ, but as one who is subordinate in all things to Christ, the principal Mediator. Therefore, we implore Mary's help to obtain for us from God, through the merits of Christ, what we ask. Thus, St. Augustine says that the only proper prayer is prayer through Christ (In Ps. 108).

thesis: *Whether an explicit invocation of Mary is necessary for her to intercede for us.*

The answer is negative. Mary can intercede for us, and she actually intercedes frequently, without our invoking her explicitly. The reason is that no grace is bestowed except through her intercession, but we actually receive many graces which were not preceded by any invocation on our part. Indeed, even to invoke the Blessed Virgin, we must have the grace of prayer, and this grace itself comes to us through her even before we invoke her.

Therefore, Mary, even without having been invoked, comes to our assistance, in imitation of Christ, who not only bestows the graces

we ask, but also many others not asked for; for example, those that move us to pray or those that move sinners to repentance.14

For that reason Pope Leo XIII writes: "When we have recourse to Mar/ in prayer, we are having recourse to the Mother of mercy, who is so well disposed toward us that, whatever the necessity that presses upon us, especially in attaining eternal life, she is instantly at our side of her own accord, even though she has not been invoked. She dispenses grace with a generous hand from that treasure with which from the beginning she was divinely endowed in fullest abundance." 15

St. Germanus of Constantinople exclaims: "O Mary, who, after thy Son, is as solicitous for the whole human race as thou art? Who protects us in our trials as thou dost?" 18

Commenting on the miracle at the wedding at Cana, St. Bernardine of Siena writes: "By her intercession the Virgin Mother spoke as if she were responsible for the care of all . . . and seeing our need, she turns her glance of pity towards us as if there were no need to move her by our petitions. . . . Realizing that she is the pious Mother of all men, she pleads *for* her children and, even without being asked, she approaches her Son, saying, 'They have no wine.' If she performed that work without being asked, what will she do if she is asked? If she did that while living on earth, what will she do now that she reigns in heaven?"17

Miguel Ghislcri states: "Long before she is invoked, her pity comes to our aid and she anticipates the petitions of the wretched.",a

"Usually she does not wait until she is approached," says Theophilus Raynaud, "as if she grants her favors only when requested, but she anticipates the petitions of the needy by the charity with which she is inflamed on our behalf."10

Although it may not be necessary in each instance to invoke Mary explicitly to come to our assistance, nevertheless, it is necessary to go to her sometimes, because the frequency and fervor with which we pray to her will influence her pious intercession in obtaining heavenly graces *for us.*

However, it can be said that Mary is invoked implicitly every time the faithful pray for salvation in conformity with the order established by divine providence, according to which order, no grace is bestowed upon us except through Mar}'. Thus, Pope Leo XIII, in his

encyclical *Jucunda semper,* quotes St. Bernardine of Siena: "Every grace granted to man in this life has three successive steps: from God it comes to Christ, from Christ, to the Virgin, and from the Virgin it descends to us.''20

It does not follow from this that the invocation of the saints is useless and that only the Blessed Virgin should be invoked. Mary's most powerful intercession with God docs not exclude the invocation of the saints, whom God also wishes us to honor and to that end He made them dispensers of particular favors. Nevertheless, divine providence has determined that the saints do not obtain the graces wc ask except through Christ and dependent on the intercession of Mary'. For that reason, St. Anselm of Canterbury says: "If thou art silent, no one will pray for us, no one will help us. But if thou dost pray for us, then will all the saints do the same and succor us.''21 Van Ketwigh expresses the same thought by saying that the prayers of the saints obtain nothing for us unless Mary's impétration is added to theirs.22

Cult of Imitation

Among the acts which pertain to Mary's cult, the third is the imitation of her most excellent virtues, because we should imitate those we venerate. As St. Gregory the Great expresses it: "True veneration of the saints consists in imitation of the saints." 23

t h e s i s: *Mary, the Mother of God, should be imitated by those who wish to honor her.*

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Leo XIII says: "In Mary we see how a truly good and provident God has established for us a most suitable example of every virtue. As wc look upon her and think about her, we are not cast down as though stricken by the overpowering splendor of God's power; but, on the contrary, attracted by the closeness of the common nature we share with her, wc strive with greater confidence to imitate her." 24

Pope Pius X: "Whoever, then, wishes—and no one ought not so to wish—that his devotion should be perfect and worthy of her,

should go further and strive to his utmost to imitate her example.''*

The Fathers and Doctors. St. Jerome says: "We follow the example of the best; take as your model the Blessed Virgin, whose purity was such that she merited to be the Mother of God." *

St. Ambrose states that Mary's life serves as a model in which we can find lessons in rectitude, teaching us what we should correct, what we should avoid, and what we should retain. Mary was such that her life alone serves as a discipline and norm for all.2T

St. Bernard says that the Blessed Virgin knows and loves those who love her and she is close to those who invoke her, especially those who imitate her chastity and humility.28

After recommending devotion to the Blessed Virgin, St. Bonaventure says that if such devotion is to be acceptable, one should imitate Mary's purity, humility and meekness.28

St. Peter Damian states that Mary was given us as an example so that we would follow in her footsteps.30

Theological Argument. Tire first and principal model we must imitate is Christ, who said: "And he who does not take up his cross and follow Me, is not worthy of Me" (Matt. 10:38); and: "For I have given you an example, that as I have done to you, so you also should do" (John 15:15). The Apostle says: "For those whom He has foreknown He has also predestined to become conformed to the image of His Son, that He should be the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29). Now, to follow Christ and to conform oneself to His image is none other than to imitate Him in all that is possible.

But, as St. Pius X says: *"So* deplorable is our weakness that we are sometimes discouraged by the greatness of such an example. By the providence of God, however, another example is proposed to us, which is both as near to Christ as human nature allows, and more nearly accords with the weakness of our nature. And this is no other than that of the Mother of Cod." 31

And it may well be said that to imitate Mary is to imitate Christ, since she, better than any other creature, manifests the image of Christ and also manifests lier holiness to us most fully. The likeness between Christ and Mary is described by St. Robert Bcllarmine when he compares the perfections of each and concludes by saying that he who sees Jesus, also secs the Mother of Jesus.''

thesis: *Although the cult of Mary cannot exist without some intention of imitating her, the imitation does not pertain to the essence of the cult.*

Errors. Erasmus maintains that the only cult pleasing to the Blessed Virgin is the imitation of her virtues. The more Luther and his followers reject the cult of Mary's intercession, the more they exalt the cult of her imitation. The Jansenists maintain that they uselessly honor Mary who do not imitate her.

First Part. All cult paid to Mary should lead to imitation of her virtues because Mary is presented as a model to all men of every age and condition. But reverence to the Blessed Virgin would be false if there were no intention or desire of imitating her. Hence, Campana says that if we wish to be true clients of Mary we must imitate her in her virtues.[88]

Second Part. The Fathers and Theologians. The fact that Mary is called refuge of sinners is sufficient proof that actual imitation of Mary is not required for the essence of the Marian cult. St. Ephrem, St. Germanus of Constantinople and Raymond Jourdain explicitly comment on Mary as refuge of sinners.[84] But Mary' could not rightly be called refuge of sinners if sinners could not approach her with their pleas.

Theological Argument. If Mary's cult consisted essentially in actual imitation of her, abandoning as useless and even injurious all invocation and reverence, it would be necessary that all her clients be in the state of grace; therefore, this cult could be given only by the just and pious and would have to be prohibited to sinners. But it is not right to say such a thing, because all sinners, even those who persist in sin and are unrepentant, should invoke Mary and have recourse to her assistance, for she welcomes all sinners and is ever ready to come to their aid, that they might be converted. Indeed, sinners should always be exhorted to remain faithful to their devotion to Mary.

Boudon, who courageously fought the Jansenists in France, says that under the pretext of imitating her virtues, we should not neglect the interior and exterior cult of Mary. Tliis is a means of obtaining from her the most powerful help and loving intercession, in order to work effectively towards self-renunciation, to carry our cross in a Christian manner, and to follow her beloved Son, Jesus Christ.[35]

Pope Benedict XIV is of the same mind when he says that the sinner should not abandon devotion to Mary, because the prayer of the sinner has the power of impétration if he prays for himself, with piety and perseverance, for those things necessary for salvation, as St. Thomas teaches (IIa IIae, q. 83, a. 6). And it is very possible that, by the divine mercy, the prayer of the sinner will be answered if he is not so obstinate that he refuses repentance, but perseveres in his prayer.[30]

CHAPTER SEVEN

Necessity of Devotion to Nary

*

Marian Devotion and Salvation

The marian cult discussed here is that of invocation, which carries with it honor and praise, since the cult of honor and praise is implicitly or explicitly that of invocation.

thesis: *Mary's cult is morally necessary for salvation.*

Previous Observations. A thing may be necessary in two ways: it is either *absolutely* necessary or *hypothetically* necessary, that is, in view of some end or goal. What is hypothetically necessary is either such that without it the end could not be obtained, and is therefore *simply* necessary, or such that the end cannot be obtained so easily and conveniently, and then the necessity is *relative.* This relative hypothetical necessity admits of many degrees, depending on the types of difficulties opposed to the attainment of the end or goal, and it constitutes true *moral* necessity.

It is certain that the cult of the Blessed Virgin is not *absolutely* necessary, as neither is that of the incarnation of the divine Word, nor, therefore, the very existence of the Mother of God.

Similarly, neither is the cult of the Blessed Virgin *simply* necessary for the purpose of human salvation, as is sanctifying grace, for although Mary is mediatrix of all graces, so that no one obtains grace from God except through the most generous dispensation of His Mother, nevertheless, she sometimes obtains grace for us even without our having asked for it.

Undoubtedly, devotion to Mary is a most fitting means of obtaining salvation, since frequently her clients obtain innumerable favors because of their devotion to her. As St. Bonaventure says, she is the helper and lover of those who praise her, as they know by experience.[1] The question, therefore, must be reduced to this: whether, as regards

our salvation, the cult of the Blessed Virgin transcends the limits of fittingness and constitutes a certain *moral* necessity, so that without it it would be very difficult or almost morally impossible to obtain and preserve the graces necessary for salvation. Lastly, this necessity must not be understood with regard to those who are invincibly ignorant of Mary, but with regard to those who, acknowledging her as the Mother of God, either disdain her or neglect to invoke her and to give her due honor.

Errors. The Jansenists present Mary in their Admonitions (VII-VIII) as saying: "Do not think of honoring me, as if Cod were not sufficient. If you love God, you have no need of anyone else."

Magisterium of the Popes. Pope Leo XIII says: "So great is her dignit}', so great her favor before God, that whosoever in his need will not have recourse to her is trying to fly without wings." 2

St. Pius X writes: "For can anyone fail to see that there is no surer or more direct road than by Mary, for uniting all mankind in Christ? . . . Hence too since, according to Christ Himself, 'now this is eternal life: that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent,' and since it is through Mary that we attain to the knowledge of Christ, through Mary also we most easily obtain that life of which Christ is the source and origin." 9

The Fathers, Doctors and Theologians. St. Germanus of Constantinople, "O Mary, thou art all-powerful to save sinners, nor needest thou any other recommendation, for thou art the Mother of true life."4 "No one is saved except through thee."8

St. Bernard: "This divine Mother, O my children, is the ladder *of* sinners, by which they ascend to the height of divine grace: she is my greatest confidence, she is the whole basis of my hope." 8

Theological Argument. Prayer is necessary for salvation, and therefore St. Thomas says that every man is obliged to pray. The reason is that he is obliged to procure spiritual goods which God alone can bestow, and these spiritual goods can only be obtained by asking them of God.7

And this necessity of prayer is, according to general law, not only by necessity of precept, but also by necessity of means.9 Our prayer *is* directed primarily to God, from whom we must hope for all good; secondarily, to the saints, as our patrons and intercessors before the divine majesty. But although there is no prohibition whatever of in-

yoking God in an immediate manner, nevertheless, according to the order He established, when we wish to pray to God, we should turn to the saints, so that they may make intercession and pray to God for us.

But Mary holds first place among all the saints, as Pope Leo XIII says in these words: "Now, of all the blessed in heaven, who can compare with the august Mother of God in obtaining grace? Who sees more clearly in the Eternal Word what troubles oppress us, what are our needs? Who is allowed more power in moving God? Who can compare with her in maternal affection?" 0

For that reason Sudrez states that it is the sentiment of the universal Church, "that the intercession and prayers of Mary arc, above those of all others, not only useful, but necessary." 10 And certainly, we should pray to Mary', not just sometimes, but always, begging her patronage and asking her help on the road to salvation."

In conformity with the *moral necessity* of devotion to the Blessed Virgin is the fact that *there is no positive precept of the Church which obliges us to invoke or honor the Blessed Virgin in any special way.* The Church requires that we do not reject devotion to Mary, a thing which could scarcely be done without erring against faith. It also requires that we observe Mary's feasts and it asserts in many ways the utility and necessity of recourse to her, through whose hands so many and so great helps to salvation come to us.

Neither is there a *divine positive precept* concerning the cult of the Blessed Virgin, although in Sacred Scripture and in Christian tradition there are many statements which promote and advise it.

For that reason, the necessity of devotion to Mary is based simply on natural law, not direct and explicit, but indirect and implicit, because natural law requires us to seek the means proportionate to the attainment of the end.12

Now, by the will of God, devotion to the Blessed Virgin is a moral necessity, and neglect of it is no small obstacle. For, although Mary, the consort in human redemption, our most benign Mother, dispensatrix of all graces and universal advocate of the human race, sometimes assists men even without their praying to her, she gives the most efficacious help to her clients when they piously invoke her.»

hesis: *Singular devotion to Mary is a sign of predestination.*

There is no doubt that the predestination of the elect is in itself so certain that none of the predestined can be lost, as is evident from the words of Christ: "My sheep hear My voice, and I know them and they follow Me. And I give them everlasting life; and they shall never perish, neither shall anyone snatch them out of My hand" (John 10:27-28), and from the teaching of St. Paul: "And those whom He has predestined, them He has also called; and those whom He has called, them He has also justified, and those whom He has justified, them He has also glorified" (Rom. 8:30). Hence, St. Augustine says: "If any of the elect were to perish, God would be deceived; but none of them perish, for God does not deceive Himself."[14]

It is *de fide* that man is not and can never be certain of his predestination, except by a particular revelation, *for* those things which depend on the will of God cannot be known except through divine revelation. But since this is not ordinarily given, none of the predestined can know their future for certain.[15]

From Christ's own lips we know that the good thief had this divine revelation. It also seems to have been given to the apostles after the coming of the Holy Ghost, so that they could more confidently and diligently preach the Gospel to all nations. Moreover, as Satolli says,[10] it is pleasant to think that to many of the elect God bestows this ineffable consolation of certitude shortly before their death. And although no one can be certain *of* being included in the number of the predestined, apart from a special revelation, St. Bernard says that there are signs of predestination which give a conjectural certitude.[17]

The Fathers, Doctors and Theologians. St. Ephrem salutes Mary: "Hail, Mary, certain salvation of Christians who sincerely and truly have recourse to thee."[18]

St. John Damascene addresses the Blessed Virgin as follows: "Receive the prayer of thy sinful servant who nevertheless loves thee ardently and honors thee and considers thee his only hope of *joy* ... and certain pledge of salvation."[ie]

Eadnier: "Let us strive as much as *possible* to recognize as much as possible the love of such a good Mother. . . . Therefore, to him who is accustomed to think frequently and with great sweetness

about her, I predict that this will be for him no small indication of eternal salvation." 20

St. Bernard: "It is certain that we shall be saved only through grace. Why, brethren, do we seek other things? Let us seek grace and let us seek it through Mary, because she always finds what she seeks." 21

St. Thomas Aquinas says that Mary has been given the great privilege of saving all the guilty and the evil doers who approach her.22

Richard of St. Lawrence: "In the future life Mary will glorify those who serve and honor her in the present life." 23

Raymond Jourdain: "She loves those who love her. Even more, she serves those who serve her . . . and she will glorify them in the future if they honor her in the present." 24

St. Lawrence Justinian puts the following words in the mouth of Christ, speaking from the Cross to His Mother: "No one who invokes thee will be ignored, and no client of thine will be alien to Me."25

St. Alphonsus Liguori: "It is impossible that any client of Mary be condemned if he faithfully honors her and commends himself to her." 26

Theologians of all schools consider devotion to Mary as a sign of predestination. Thus, Gonet says that special devotion to Mary is like a mystical ladder by which God descends to men and men ascend to heaven,27 and Hurter affirms that devotion to Mary is no less a sign of predestination than devotion to Christ.28

Theological Argument. All theologians agree in maintaining that eternal life is given as a reward for good works, that is, for the merits, virtues and good works executed in the state of grace during life. All of this ordinarily depends on the devotion men have for the Blessed Virgin, since it is evident that when devotion to Mary grows cold, the spiritual life is weakened, and when devotion to Mary is more fervent, the spiritual life becomes stronger.

Corollary. Just as sincere devotion to Mary is a sign of predestination, so disdain of her is interpreted as a sign of reprobation. Thus, St. Germanus of Constantinople states that when the Son of God shall come in justice, many will weep when they realize that because they were not willing to recognize tlic Mother of God, they will be deprived of a great treasure.28 And even the heretic Ecolampadius

stated: "Never let it be heard that I am hostile to Mary, of whom to think evil, I judge a sure sign of reprobation."*»

thesis: *Which type of devotion to Mary is a sign of eternal predestination.*

Three kinds of devotion to Mary can be distinguished: perfect, imperfect, and false. Perfect devotion is that which honors and praises Mary by imitating her through avoidance of sin, observance of the divine law and the perfect love of God.

Imperfect devotion has two different aspects. The less imperfect devotion consists in honoring and praising Mary, but the individual is still under the yoke of sin, although there is a resolute will to be converted, and the individual prays for her assistance. The more imperfect devotion is found in him who honors Mary but is still in the state of sin, and although he does not have the actual intention to repent, he does not reject all thought of conversion, but hopes that with Mary's help he will eventually give up sin and be reconciled to God, at least at the end of his life.

False devotion is that which consists entirely in external *practices,* while the individual not only continues in sin but presumes that, with the help of the Virgin, he will obtain forgiveness of his sins and thus be saved.81

It is true that perfect devotion to Mary, practiced continually, is a true sign of predestination, as is demonstrated most clearly by the testimonies we have given from the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. It is also certain that false devotion in no way is a sign of predestination; rather, those who practice it, says St. Alphonsus Liguori, deserve chastisement, and not mercy.·18 Therefore, it is a question of imperfect devotion; that is, whether this devotion is also a sign of eternal predestination. The Jansenists, in order to undermine devotion to the Blessed Virgin, put the following words in her mouth: "Do not think that because you practice devotion to me that you are predestined, if you have not charity. Only charity distinguishes between the children of God and the children of the devil" (Adv. III). But this is most absurd, for it would mean that no one in mortal sin is predestined. Then it would be logical to conclude that Peter and Paul and other great saints such as Mary Magdalen

and St. Augustine were not predestined. Others who hold this opinion arc Choiseul, Baillct, Muratori, and others.[38]

Therefore, it must be affirmed that even imperfect devotion to Mary is a sign of predestination, although imperfectly and remotely.

Thus, St. Ephrcm and many other Fathers and ecclesiastical writers refer to her as tlie refuge of sinners. She is invoked as such so that sinners will cease their evil ways and be saved.

St. Ildephonse of Toledo states that without the Blessed Virgin, one travels on the road to damnation. Therefore, we should place ourselves under her mantle and confess our sins.[84]

Fulbert of Chartres: "Let sinners come to Mary, striking their breasts and weeping tears, and if they are truly repentant they will receive mercy." [85]

St. Peter Damian addresses Mary: "Do not let your hand tire in seeking occasions to save the wretched and of bestowing mercy, for thy glory is not diminished but increased when penitent sinners receive pardon and the justified reach glory." [80]

Pope Innocent III says that he who is lost in the darkness of sin should call upon Mary and she, through her Son, will illumine his heart with the light of penance.[37]

St. Thomas Aquinas states that Mary has been privileged with so great a dignity so that all the guilty and evil-doers that have recourse to her may be saved.[88]

St. Bernardine of Busti declares that just as Mary is more powerful with God than all the saints, so she intercedes for us more fervently and more diligently. Therefore, a sinner need not yield to despair, but should have recourse to such a powerful and benign advocate."

As we have already stated, imperfect devotion to the Blessed Virgin may be less imperfect or more imperfect. The basic difference between the two is that in the former there is the actual will to give up sin; in the latter, the desire for repentance is not completely rejected. In either type, however, if sinners practice devotion to Mary and persevere in it, they can have the hope of being received kindly by the Mother of mercy, and through her patronage obtain the grace of true repentance and ultimate salvation.

Sinners who practice devotion to Mary and have the actual intention of abandoning sin, may prudently expect her efficacious assistance for salvation. Although the devotion of the just or that of

the sincerely repentant sinners is more acceptable to Mary, that of the sinner who has not yet done penance is also pleasing to her, because his acts of faith, hope and fear of hell arc formally good before his justification; so also is his devotion to Mary. As Richard of St. Lawrence asks: "Can the Mother of mercy, full of grace, disdain one who invokes her holy name with all his heart?"

Sinners who do not yet have the actual intention of abandoning sin but do not completely exclude the resolve to do penance, may still hope for salvation through Mary's patronage. Thus, Pope Benedict XIV states that lest anyone misinterpret his words and think that sinners should abandon devotion to Mary because their prayers and good works are of no avail, they should realize that the prayer of a sinner has impetratory value through the divine mercy if he prays for himself perseveringly and asks something necessary for salvation.40

Petitalot states that there always remains to the sinner as a hope of salvation his devotion to Mary, however imperfect it may be. Whatever anyone does for her will not go without its reward. The actions of sinners cannot merit very much, but Mary is so good that she takes account of the smallest intention.41 There are numerous examples of those who had no intention of changing their lives but have been converted to true repentance by their devotion to Mary.42

However, there is always the possibility and the fear that habitual sinners will become obdurate in their sins and abandon their devotion to Mary, to perish wretchedly at the end of their life. *It is* therefore necessary to warn such persons against the rejection of this last help and to encourage them not to cease calling upon Mary.42

Corollary. Since devotion to the Blessed Virgin *is* a sign of predestination, it follows that the hope of salvation *by this* means is in proportion to one's devotion. Therefore, while perfect devotion *is the* claim of a firm hope of salvation for the clients of Mary, imperfect devotion does not give them a right, but only a weak hope. Nevertheless, even with this sign of the devotion to Mary, whatever its perfection, we should never cease to fear for our eternal salvation, for, as St. Augustine says, "even those who travel well, experience fear, since it is not known who will arrive."44

Benefits of Devotion to Mary

Having studied the necessity of devotion to Mary, we shall now consider the many benefits which can be derived therefrom.

St. Paul tell us (I Tim. 4:8) that "godliness is profitable in all respects, since it has the promise of the present life as well as of that which is to come." We can apply this especially to devotion to Mar}', in conformity with the prayer of the Church in the Mass for the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin: "Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, that Thy holy sacraments, which we have received in celebration of this annual feast, may be for us both a healing remedy against all the ills of this life, and an assurance of happiness in that which is to come."[45]

BENEFITS TO THE INDIVIDUAL

The utility of the Marian cult in relation to the individual persons who honor Mary can be considered with regard to the present life and the future life.

t h e s i s : *The benefits or advantages Mary's clients obtain in the present life.*

As exemplary cause and as impetratory cause Mary bestows spiritual benefits on her clients.

As *exemplary cause.* It is impossible that anyone giving devotion to Mar}' would not feel himself little by little imbued by her spirit and sentiments and not imitate her virtues. St. Bonaventure says that he has never read of even one saint who did not have a special devotion to the glorious Virgin.[40] For that reason both those who follow the common way of perfection by the observance of the commandments, and those who live the life of the evangelical counsels, always look upon devotion to Mary as a perpetual model of holiness and virtue. And so it is that Mary is not only presented, after Christ, as an absolute model of perfection in the fulfillment of the divine precepts, but also in that of prompt obedience, voluntary poverty, and especially the purest virginity.

As *impetratory cause.* Although Mary, through her offices as our most pious Mother, as advocate and universal patroness of men, distributes to all the helps sufficient for salvation, nevertheless, efficacious assistance is not ordinarily given to adults without true devotion to the most Blessed Virgin. St. Bonaventure says: "Although the grace of the Virgin redounds to all . . . as regards sufficiency, it is not so as regards efficacy, except only in those who render themselves worthy of receiving it." *T This capacity or preparation for receiving more helps of grace or for experiencing more of Mary's beneficence will be in proportion to the greater devotion of men toward her.48

Truly, those most devoted to Mary are her best children, not only by the general law of Christ (John 19:26), but by a special title, for by a personal free choice, they accept her as Mother and respect and love her, placing themselves under her protection. Moreover, it is well known that a mother tends to give more protection and maternal love to those of her children who manifest the greatest love for her. Thus, while those who have no devotion to Mary lack many aids to salvation, the Blessed Virgin herself obtains greater or less means of salvation for men according to the degree of their devotion to her, and she will obtain abundant graces and even the grace of final perseverance for those who faithfully and fervently honor her.

Maiy's clients usually obtain from her not only spiritual goods, but also temporal and external goods, such as success in undertakings, help in tribulation, safety in dangers on land and sea, and bodily strength and health. Accordingly, when Asiatic cholera ravaged Italy in 1884, Pope Leo XIII exhorted the faithful to implore the intercession of Mary.48 St. Germanus of Constantinople speaks of Mary as "medicine of my wounds, consolation in my laments and comfort in my sufferings." 50 St. John Damascene refers to Mary as "inexhaustible fountain of health," ·* and St. Amadeus of Lausanne states that she is not only the health of souls, but of bodies as well, and she provides for our bodily needs.02

In litanies she is called "Health of the sick." God is certainly the one who heals (Mich. 6:9), but Mary moves Him to bestow health. And although she does not always obtain bodily health for the sick immediately, since she does not always attend to our desire, but rather to our utility, she does not for that reason cease to be the

health of the sick. She always grants greater favors than the ones we pray for, soothing us with sweet consolations and inspiring us with Christian fortitude, which arc much more salutary than health of body. Therefore, in praying to Mary for bodily recovery, we should subject ourselves completely to her will, praying as did the leper to Jesus: "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean" (Matt. 8:2).

t h e s i s: *The benefits which Mary's clients will receive in the future life.*

In this question we study two things: the passing of men from this life to the next and the condition of man in the future life. In man's passing from this life to the next, we must consider in the first place, the separation of the soul from the body by death, and in the second, the particular judgment of each soul after death.

The condition of each man in the next life at any given moment is that of beatitude, of damnation or of purification. Since we have previously discussed the help of Mary with respect to these conditions, we limit the present question to the study of Mary's assistance to her clients at the hour of death and at the particular judgment.

Mary's assistance of her clients at the hour of death. Pope Benedict XV teaches that one can hope for the grace of a happy death from the Blessed Virgin because through her hands we receive all graces.'3

The same doctrine is taught by the Fathers of the Church. Thus, St. Ephrem addresses the Blessed Virgin: "Assist me now and always, O Virgin Mother of God, benign and clement Mother of mercy, my protector during the present life . . . and preserver of my soul at tlie last moment." M

St. Bernard states that Mary's mercy extends even to the assistance she gives to her clients in their last moment."

St. Bonaventure says: "I ask thee, O Mary, for the glory of thy name, to come and meet my soul when it is departing from this world, and to take it in thy arms. Disdain not, O Mary, to come then and comfort me with thy presence. Be thyself my soul's ladder and way to heaven. Do thou thyself obtain for it the grace of forgiveness and eternal repose. O Mary, our advocate, it is for thee to defend thy clients and to undertake their cause before the tribunal of Jesus Christ." "

Alphonsus Salmerôn: "By the fact of having attended Christ at His birth and His death, Mary was made worthy to assist as a loving Mother at the birth of the children of God and to help them especially at the hour of their death." 57

The Church prays to Mary as follows:

"O Mary, Mother of all grace,
Mother of mercy to our race.
Protect us now from Satan's power
And receive us at life's closing hour."88

Mary's assistance at the particular judgment. The Jansenists do not admit that the Blessed Virgin gives any assistance at the divine judgment of those who were her clients. However, the Fathers and theologians generally teach that Mary does come to the aid *of* those who were devoted to her.

St. Ephrcm: "Assist me now and always, O Virgin Mother of God, benign and clement Mother of mercy. . . . Free me from eternal condemnation on the terrible day of judgment and unite me at last with the number of the just."89

St. Bonaventure: "I shall rejoice and be filled with joy because whatever my judgment will be is dependent on the sentence *of* my Mother and my Brother." 80

Richard of St. Lawrence: "If you are a sinner and fear the Judge, she will restrain Him." 81

St. Antoninus: "The wisdom and eloquence of the advocate is manifested in three things, namely, that he wins before a just and wise judge, over a craft}' and astute enemy, in a hopeless case. This is verified in the Blessed Virgin, with respect to God, a most wise and just Judge, against the devil, a more crafty enemy, and in the hopeless case between God and man, in which no man dares to speak." 82

Sedlmayr states that Mary is our advocate principally in the divine judgment.88

Let us now consider briefly the way in which Mary gives assistance at the judgment. In human causes there is first required a discussion of the case, but in the divine judgment this is not necessary,

because by a single act of His intellect God knows perfectly, and from all eternity, all the merits and demerits of men.

When the sentence is passed by God, it is addressed to souls that are separated from the body and is not therefore expressed in words, but in a purely intellectual manner. Once the sentence is declared, it is effective immediately and the soul enters heaven, purgatory or hell.

Although some have maintained that the guardian angels and other patrons, as well as devils, intervene as witnesses at the particular judgment, theologians generally deny the presence of such. However, it may be admitted that certain angels, such as St. Michael, do intervene in the execution of the sentence, since the Latin liturgy states that he has been constituted prince of the souls that are to be received.[01]

It is evident that God alone has the right to judge, and, therefore, it is common to the Trinity, although it is appropriated to the Word of God, as St. Thomas says: "The standard of judgment is the law of wisdom or truth, according to which the judgment is passed. Now because the Son is Wisdom begotten, and Truth proceeding from the Father, and His perfect Image, consequently, judiciary power is properly attributed to the Son of God." [08]

But this judiciary power not only becomes Christ inasmuch as He is Cod and the Son of God, but also inasmuch as He is man, as St. John says: "For neither does the Father judge any man, but all judgment He has given to the Son" (5:22) "and He has granted Him power to render judgment, because He is Son of Man" (v. 27). St. Thomas comments by saying that all judgment is vested in Jesus Christ according to His human nature (In *Joan.* 5, lect. 5).

Therefore, Christ, as God, is the judge both in the particular judgment, which takes place immediately after death, and in the general judgment. Christ as man is the judge in the general judgment, as is evident in many passages of Holy Scripture. Thus, we read in St. Matthew: "For the Son of Man is to come with His angels in the glory of His Father, and then He will render to everyone according to his conduct" (16:27). St. Mark says: "And then they will see the Son of Man coming upon clouds with great power and majesty" (13:26). And in St. Paul we read: "For all of us must be made manifest before the tribunal of Christ, so that each one may receive what

he has won through the body, according to his works, whether good or evil" (II Cor. 5:10).

Whether Christ as man is the judge of souls in the particular judgment is disputed among theologians. Gotti maintains that the most probable opinion is that which maintains that Christ is the judge in the particular judgment inasmuch as He is the Word of God, since by reason of His divinity He is ever present to all and all are present to Him.

Stentrup, Paquet and others maintain that Christ is the judge in the particular judgment, not only as the Son of God, but also as man, because this judgment enters into the exercise of the power of Christ, whom God has constituted judge of both the living and the dead (Acts 10:42). To Jesus Christ, therefore, belongs all judgment over them.[011]

Nevertheless, in order for the particular judgment to take place, the soul docs not have to ascend to the throne of Christ, nor does Christ descend bodily from heaven. Rather, the divine Judge is present to them by purely intellectual communication.®[7]

That being the case, it seems that, as for Mary's assisting her clients in the divine judgment, the following must be admitted:

1) Mary does not mediate *personally* in the divine judgment in order to defend the cause of her clients, since Christ does not appear bodily, seated on any throne, the guardian angel is not present to assist, nor does the devil appear there to defend or accuse. St. Cyril of Alexandria says that the *Judge* has need *of* none of them, for He alone places before the eyes of the sinners all they have done, said and intended.[88]

Therefore, the description of the particular judgment, in which the soul is taken to the tribunal of Christ, before whom the Blessed Virgin intercedes for him, his guardian angel acts as his advocate, and the devil is his cruel accuser; or that description in which the particular judgment is compared to a scale in which the devils place the accumulation of sins on one side and the angels place all the good works on the right, are used figuratively or metaphorically. Thus, Gotti [07] believes that the particular judgment is so described so that the faithful will be better able to understand tins judgment, will fear it, and live saintly *lives.*

2) *Nor* should Mary's assistance be understood as intervening in

divine judgment in order to change the decree of God's justice through her prayers, or to free those already condemned to eternal fire.

3) The assistance of the Blessed Virgin before the divine Judge must be understood as given to her clients in what we could call the door of the judgment, that is, at the moment of death; or during their life, by recalling to them the rigor of the judgment so that they will not sin; and finally, by her powerful intercession, she obtains for them the helps to live a holy life, or at least to die in the state of grace and thus avoid the chastisement of God's justice on that dreadful day.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF MARIAN DEVOTION

There are three societies to be considered as beneficiaries of Marian devotion: the Church, the family or domestic society, and the nation or political society.

The Church of Christ receives countless benefits, both doctrinal and moral, from devotion to Mary. The doctrinal influence is described as follows by Pope Leo XIII:

> She has even, as this same Doctor claims (St. Cyril), upheld and given strength to the sceptre of the orthodox faith. It has been her unremitting concern to see to it that the Catholic faith stands firmly lodged in the midst of the people, there to thrive in its fertile and undivided unity. Many and well known are the proofs of her solicitude, manifested from time to time even in a miraculous manner. In the times and places in which, to the Church's grief, faith languished in lethargic indifference or was tormented by the baneful scourge of heresy, our great and gracious Lady in her kindness was ever ready with her aid and comfort.
>
> Under her inspiration, strong with her might, great men were raised up—illustrious for their sanctity no less than for their apostolic spirit—to beat off the attacks of wicked adversaries and to lead souls back into the virtuous ways of Christian life, firing them with a consuming love of the things of God. One such man, an army in himself, was Dominic Guzman. Putting all his trust in our Lady's Rosary, he set himself fearlessly to the accomplishment of both these tasks with happy results.

No one will fail to remark how much the merits of the venerable Fathers and Doctors of the Church, who spent their lives in the defense and explanation of the Catholic faith, redound to the Virgin Mother of Cod. For from her, the Scat of Divine Wisdom, as they themselves gratefully tell us, a strong current of the most sublime wisdom has coursed through their writings. And they were quick to acknowledge that not by themselves but by her have iniquitous errors been overcome.70

As regards the moral benefits, just as the Doctors received their doctrine from Mary, so also the saintly guides of the Church, bishops and pastors, confess having obtained strength of soul, fortitude and counsel from her, as Pope Leo XIII says: "It is as if the voice of the heavenly Queen made itself heard to Us; at one moment graciously consoling Us in the midst of trials; at another, guiding Us by her counsel in directing the great work of the salvation of souls; at another, urging Us to admonish the Christian people to advance in piety and in the practice of every virtue.''71 In like manner, all the faithful who practice devotion to Mary are aided by her and impelled to good in many different ways. Gerson goes so far as to proclaim that "just as the body cannot live without breathing, so the mystical body of the faithful cannot preserve its spiritual life without the assistance of the Blessed Virgin.''72

Croat blessings are also bestowed on the family or domestic society through devotion to Mary. The family is the very basis of all social life. Destroy family life, and all society necessarily falls. But the sound and good structure of family life depends to a great extent on the social status of women. In pre-Christian times, and even today in some areas, the social condition of a wife was that of a slave and servant. Aristotle stated that not only among ancient barbarians, but even among the Greeks and the Romans, woman was held in low esteem. 'Die Christian religion became the patron and defender of woman, raising her from her degraded *condition and giving* her a position of honor. Tliis was due in no small measure to the honor and reverence paid to Mary, who was hailed as the exemplar and model of all women.

'Die Holy Family is proposed as a model to be imitated, as Pope Leo XIII states: “In Joseph, fathers of families have the most beautiful model of fatherly attention and providence; in the most *holy*

Virgin Mother of God, the most extraordinary pattern of love, modesty, perfect submission, and fidelity; in Jesus, who as Son of the household was subject to them, a divine exemplar of obedience to admire, worship, and imitate.'"'

Finally, there are also remarkable benefits which redound to the Christian people from Marian piety. Mary not only defends the Christian people from evils threatening them, but also obtains social good for them to a remarkable degree. Pope Leo XIII writes; "Ancient and modem history and the more sacred annals of the Church bear witness to public and private supplications addressed to the Mother of God, to the help she has granted in return, and to the peace and tranquillity which she has obtained from God. Hence her illustrious titles of 'Help of Christians,' 'Consolation of the afflicted/ 'Our power in war,' 'Queen of Victors',' 'Queen of peace.' . . . And do you, Venerable Brethren, the more you have at heart the honor of Mary and the welfare of human society, the more diligently apply yourselves to nourish the piety of the people toward the great Virgin and to increase their confidence in her." 74

And in truth, many times the Christian people have experienced Mary's powerful help in combats against the infidels and against other enemies. So many victories were won by the Christians with Mary's help that they fill the annals of history and we cannot list all of them here. Nevertheless, we shall mention two of the most illustrious victories. The first is the victory of 1212, won by King Alfonso VIII of Castile over a great army of Moors. 'Hie Christian soldiers marched behind the Cross of Christ and the banner of the King, on which was painted the image of Mary.

Tire second great victory was won by Don Juan of Austria, brother of Philip II and general of the Christian army, in a battle against the Turks in 1571. Pope Leo XIII refers to it by saying: "Tire efficacy and power of this devotion (the Rosary) was also wondrously exhibited in the sixteenth century, when the vast forces of the Turks threatened to impose on nearly the whole of Europe the yoke of superstition and barbarism. At that time the Supreme Pontiff, St. Pius V, after arousing the determination of a common defense among all the Christian princes, strove, above all, with the greatest zeal to obtain for Christendom the favor of the most powerful Mother of God. So noble an example offered to heaven and earth in those times

rallied around him all the minds and hearts of the age. And thus Christ's faithful warriors, prepared to sacrifice their life and blood for the salvation of their faith and their country, proceeded undauntedly to meet their foe near the Gulf of Corinth; while those who were unable to take part formed a pious band of suppliants, who called on Mary and unitedly saluted her again and again in the words of the Rosary, imploring her to grant the victory to their companions engaged in battle. Our sovereign Lady did grant her aid; for in the naval battle near the Echinades Islands the Christian fleet gained, with no great loss to itself, a magnificent victory in which the enemy was completely routed. And it was to preserve the memory of the great favor thus granted, that the same holy Pontiff desired that a feast in honor of Our Lady of Victories should celebrate the anniversary of so memorable a struggle, the feast which Gregory XIII dedicated under the title of the Holy Rosary."[78]

The cult of Mary contributes admirably to the good of society. The good of society extends not only to things *of the* body, such as wealth and material goods, but also, saving the direct power of the Church in spiritual matters, to those of the soul, such as religion, modesty, the cultivation of arts and letters, and so on. Thus, De Munnyck, speaking at the First International Catholic Week of Geneva in 1929, stated that both the personal and the collective evolution to greater perfection could be inferred from the command of Christ: "You therefore are to be perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. 5:48).

And in truth, devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary benefits human society because it promotes religion, encourages modesty, and influences the arts and letters.

Since the Christian religion is based entirely on the mystery of the Incarnation, which was effected through the Blessed Virgin, by the fact that she is honored as the Mother of God by a special cult, faith in Christ is also increased and strengthened. Christ is thereby glori lied because Mary is inseparable *from Him in the* devotion and love of the faithful.

As regards modesty', it goes without saying that wherever there is true devotion and faithful imitation of the immaculate Virgin and most pure Mother, there will likewise be found a high level of purity in all walks of life.

It is not at all necessary to verify the claim that devotion to Mary has had a tremendous influence in the arts. One may visit any church or museum or study the literature of any Christian nation and he will find copious evidence of the fact that artists and writers throughout the centuries have shown a special predilection for Mary.[78]

CHAPTER EIGHT

Origin and Jntic/uity of Parian Devotion

*

Although from what we have said there is no lack of data concerning the true origin of devotion to Mary, as well as its antiquity, it is fitting to study these subjects as separate questions.

Origin of Marian Devotion

Errors. Some Protestants, cited by Canisius, imagined that many elements from paganism were introduced into devotion to Mary, and as a result they have compared Catholics to idolaters who publicly venerated goddesses and even dedicated temples to them.[1]

Many Rationalists asserted that the cult of the Virgin Mother of God was introduced by newly converted pagans, who entered the Church in the fourth century. Thus, Noyon maintained that when the pagans entered the Church *en masse,* they brought with them their pagan mentality. They were *still* attached to the notion of feminine deities and were thoroughly imbued with a confused cult charged with mysticism. Because of the austere monotheism *of the official* Church, their aspirations were satisfied by constantly exaggerating honor, cult and prayer to the Mother of Jesus. Mary thus became the substitute *for* their goddesses, and without *daring to* acknowledge it, they actually made her a goddess?

But the cult of the mother-goddess in paganism *existed* under two forms: in a *naturalistic* form as the universal mother, representing the *life* and *fertility of the* earth, and in an *anthropomorphic form,* presenting the mother-goddess under various names, *eg·. Isis* in Egypt, Ihstar in Babylonia, *Artemis in Ephesus, Aphrodite* and *Cybele in*

Greece, Astarté in France, and so forth. The cult of the mother-goddess eventually degenerated into obscene ceremonies and practices and all kinds of immorality.

thesis: *Mary's cult differs absolutely from any pagan cult, and it is neither essentially nor accidentally derived from it.*

First Part. That Mary's cult differs greatly from pagan cult is proved by the fact that the mother-goddess of the pagans was venerated by an idolatrous cult. But Mary could never be considered a goddess nor was she ever venerated as such. Mary is not a mother-goddess, but the Mother of God, that is, the Mother of the Word Incarnate, whom she truly conceived according to human nature. Nor does she merit the cult of latria, which is proper to God alone, but hyperdulia.

Therefore, when certain Christian women, known in Africa as Collyridians, honored Mary as a goddess, and offered in her honor a kind of bread made in small loaves, a custom which had prevailed in the pagan cult of Ceres, St. Epiphanius reprimanded them for their excesses. "Mary should truly be venerated," said the Saint, "but the Father, Son and Holy Spirit should be adored." No one should adore Mary. Though she is most excellent, holy and worthy of honor, yet she is not on this account to be adored.

Moreover, the mysteries of the mother-goddess is paganism were full of immorality, and the pagan priests gave themselves to all kinds of obscenity. All of this is an absolute antithesis to the cult of the Blessed Virgin, who, through her most singular dignity and excellency, is presented to her clients as an example of all purity, holiness and moral sublimity. We therefore find frequent condemnations by the Fathers of the Church, who reprobated the abominable pagan practices.[8]

Second Part. Having stated this radical difference between the cult of Mary and that of the pagans, it is impossible that any influence from the latter could ever have affected Marian devotion in its essential elements. Indeed, the vigilance of the Church in regard to faith and morals has always been so alert that any errors or false practices would have been condemned immediately.

Neither can we admit any pagan influence even in the accidental elements of devotion to Mary. It frequently happens that in this

matter the distinction between analogy or resemblance and derivation or dependence, between mere succession and causal connection, is not taken into account.

In some sanctuaries the cult of Mary followed or replaced that of some pagan deity, as in Soissons, where a church was built in honor of the Blessed Virgin upon the foundations of a temple *of* Isis. Or sometimes a pagan festival was replaced by one in honor of Mary. Nevertheless, it can in no way be concluded that there was a causal connection between the two. Similarly, there may be some external similarity in pagan ceremonies and certain aspects of devotion to Mary, or even a resemblance between a pagan image and a statue or painting of the Blessed Virgin, but it would be unfounded and illogical to conclude that therefore the cult of Mary was an outgrowth of a pagan practice.

Thus, to those who maintain that the cult of the Virgin issued from paganism because in it are found some things that pagans employed in former times, St. Peter Canisius answers: "We certainly confess that there are in sacred cult some things common to us and to the pagans, but only by reason of some resemblance, as in temples, altars, sacrifices, images, prelates, ministers or priests. Similarly, if it is a question of domestic matters, Christians have much in common with pagans in food and drink, cleanliness and clothing, songs and learning, labor and commerce. But how could anyone say that all these things, both sacred and civil, passed from pagans to Christians?" *

Finally, whatever the analogy or resemblance between Marian and pagan cult, whether by reason of art or expressions, the essential difference of the theological principles that rule Christian cult, together with the diversity of the purpose proper to it, will always make a bridgeless gap between the two.® And if we are mindful of the end, the difference between Christians and pagans is immense, as St. Augustine says: "Although the use *of* some things seems similar between us and the pagans, nevertheless he who uses those things for a distinct purpose and to give thanks to God, thereby uses them in a completely different manner." '

t h e s i s : *Devotion to Mary traces its origin from the mysteries of the Incarnation and Redemption, to which are intimately united*

the divine maternity of Mary and her role as consort in redemption.

This thesis scarcely needs demonstration, since it is evident that the two most excellent motives of Marian cult, that is, her maternity, accompanied by her virginity, her holiness, and her other prerogatives, and her association with her Son in the work of the salvation of mankind, are deeply rooted in the mysteries of the Incarnation and Redemption. These two principles of Marian cult were established at the very moment of the Incarnation, although Mary was not given public and liturgical cult immediately, but it developed gradually, according to the circumstances and opportunities of the times, as we shall see in the following pages.[7]

Antiquity of Marian Devotion

Errors. Protestants say that Marian cult was introduced late into the Church and that it took on an idolatrous form, injurious to Christ. Some (like Melanchthon) say that the cult and invocation of Mary and the other saints originated with St. Gregory the Great, and that it was unknown in the early Church.

thesis: *The Marian cult existed from the very beginning of the Church; it was universally affirmed throughout the centuries and constantly increased.*

It is certain that the Blessed Virgin was given veneration as early as the apostolic times. When the apostles, after receiving the Holy Spirit, were dispersed to all parts of the world to preach Christ, they likewise preached the cult and praises of Mary. St. Cyril of Alexandria, speaking against the Nestorians, says: "The prophets announced thee and the apostles venerated thee with the highest praises." And this was reasonable, because the apostles understood profoundly the sublime dignity of the Mother of God, her excellence, holiness, purity and all the virtues which shone in her, and they professed a singular affection of piety and reverence for her. Therefore, it was logical that they should teach the early Christians to praise and glorify so excellent a Mother together with the Son.

Moreover, during the entire ante-Nicene period, the veneration in

which Mary was held was demonstrated by archaeological monuments, apocryphal books and the testimony of the holy Fathen. The archaeological monuments are painted or sculptured images of Man- in the Roman catacombs. Some represent Mery seated on a high throne and crowned with a halo—a sign which the first Christians used as proof of their veneration; others show Mary in the midst of the Apostles Peter and Paul, praying for the faithful with her arms extended, a proof that the first Christians venerated her as mediatrix.·

Although the apocryphal books are filled with fables and legends, they nevertheless reflect the religion and piety of the people of the time. As knowledge of the Virgin Mother of God and of her eminent excellence was gradually promulgated among the faithful, it was natural that they would desire to know much about her life which was lacking in the Gospel account. For that reason the apocryphal books are evidence of the ecclesiastical tradition, and it should be noted that the tradition did not spring from the apocryphal books, but they are the reflection of tradition, although some of them distorted or exaggerated the facts.® If, on the other hand, the apocryphal books have sometimes influenced the opinion of the people, the Church is not responsible. Also, nothing shows better the praise, respect, veneration and love which have ever surrounded Mary's memory than the great number of legends which circulated from earliest days concerning the most obscure phases of her life.'0

In the second century many apocryphal books were written which immoderately exalted the Blessed Virgin, inventing and publishing wondrous things in which the faithful of that time *delighted.* Outstanding among these books were the *Proto-evangelium Jacobi* and the *Ascensio Isaiae.* Not everything contained therein *is necessarily* false, since in many matters they express the belief of *the* Church or they specify certain truths of doctrine, but often the doctrine is further embellished with fables or unverified opinions.

Two types of testimony concerning Marian doctrine are found in the Fathers of the Church in the early *period. Some* refer to Mary only indirectly, as in the case of those who were defending the true human nature of Christ against the teachings of the Docetists. Thus, they expressly referred to the motherhood of Mary to show that Jesus was bom of woman and was therefore true man and possessed a physical body.

Other early Fathers spoke of Mary explicitly, either praising her virginity (St. Ignatius Martyr, St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St. Gregory Thaumaturge),[11] her remarkable holiness (St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, St. Hippolytus),[12] her cooperation in the work of redemption (St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, Tcrtullian),[13] or her power of intercession (St. Irenaeus, St. Gregory Thaumaturge).[14]

As a result of such universal teaching in the early Church, the faithful not only learned to love Mary more and more, but they commended themselves to her most powerful intercession. Nor is this surprising, since the Christian faithful had long since acquired the custom of invoking the saints, and especially the martyrs. Should they not likewise invoke Mary, the Queen of all saints? [15]

Moreover, it is not strange that the cult of Mary did not reach its fullest development in the early Church, since the times did not permit a more extensive development. Tire solicitude of the Church at the time was concentrated on the teaching of the Incarnation and on its defense against the attacks of heretics, who opposed it in different ways. Also, although the principles and foundations of Marian devotion were already firmly established in the Church, they had not been studied and expounded in such a manner that the faithful could understand them sufficiently and would be moved to give Mary a special cult. This would require tranquil times, a prolonged study and profound consideration, which were not possible in the times of persecution. St. Andrew of Crete gave this as a reason for the scarcity of early writings on the death of the Virgin.[16]

From the year 325, the knowledge of the sublime dignity of Mary and of her cult progressed extraordinarily. The Council of Nicaea solemnly defined the divinity of the Son and His consubstantiality with the Father, which the Arians fiercely opposed. The Arians directly attacked the dogma of the Blessed Trinity; indirectly they denied the divinity of the person of Christ and, therefore, the divine maternity of Mary. Hence, as a consequence of the Nicene definition, faith in the divine maternity of Mary was affirmed and strengthened, and was proposed with all clarity and firmness, although the term *Theotokos* had not yet been introduced.

It is not surprising, therefore, that so many orators and writers in the East and the West clarified Marian doctrine more and more and promulgated her cult. In the East, St. Ephrem addressed the Blessed

Virgin by pions and tender invocations.[17] St. Epiphanius, who reproved the excesses of the Collyridians, attested to and praised the cult which was already being given Mary.[18] St. Gregory of Nyssa, in his life of St. Gregory Thaumaturge, presents the Blessed Virgin as assisting the faithful and sending the apostle St. John to teach St. Gregory a creed of the true faith.[19] St. Gregory Nazianzen relates the miraculous liberation of St. Justina through the prayers of the Blessed Virgin.[20]

In the West, St. Ambrose recommended the cult of the imitation *of* Mary, presenting her as an example and model of all virgins.[21]

Following the peace of Constantine the Great, devotion to Mary grew constantly. Churches were built in her honor and special liturgical feasts were introduced. Bishop Theonas built a church in Alexandria and it was later enlarged and consecrated to the Mother of God by his successor, Alexander (373-380). Eutychius, the patriarch of Alexandria, attests that in the same city a church was dedicated to the Mother of God by Theophilus (385-412). In Palestine, the Church of the Nativity, called by St. Jerome the Church of the Cave of the Savior, which goes back to Constantine's time, was distinguished not only as a shrine of the Lord, but also as a sanctuary erected in honor of the miraculous conception of Christ by Mary, His Mother.

With reference to the Western Church, Pope St. Sylvester (314-335) had a church constructed on the very site of the temple of the goddess Vesta near the Roman Forum. It is called the ancient church of St. Mary. Similarly, the principal church of Ephesus, in which was later celebrated the Ecumenical Council, was dedicated to Mary.

Although cult was given to Mary in the feasts of the Nativity, Epiphany, Resurrection and so on, which are primarily feasts of the Lord, particular feasts were gradually instituted in honor of the Blessed Virgin. The first feast proper to Mary was instituted around the year 380. It was known as the memory of the Mother of God, and in the most ancient documents was called the Feast of the Holy Virgin or Feast of the Glorious Mother. The monks of Palestine used to celebrate it as a commemoration of Mary's divine maternity, and especially her virginal conception. Jugie, contrary to others, maintains that this feast was dedicated to the Annunciation, because of a sermon preached in the year 429 by Proclus in Constantinople. in which

he lavished great praise on the Virgin Mother and on Christ who was bom of her.[22]

From the time of the Council of Ephesus, in which the dogma of the divine maternity of Mary was solemnly proclaimed against Nestorius, her incomparable dignity, together with her other remarkable prerogatives, were widely celebrated and taught to the faithful. As a result, the devotion and the cult to her likewise increased. According to Tixerant,[28] the splendid eulogies addressed to the Mother of God by St. Cyril after the decision of the Council of Ephesus were repeated by many preachers and writers in succeeding centuries. The absolute virginity of Mary had been accepted as an indisputable dogma. Although there was no precise formula regarding Mary's exemption from original sin, the notion is already present in the Greek theology of that epoch, although the Greeks would never be so preoccupied with the question of original sin as were the Latins. Mary is elevated above the angels and the apostles; she is also recognized as the mediatrix through whom all graces come to us from God.

In addition to St. Cyril, the indefatigable defender of Mary's divine maternity', many noteworthy Fathers and theologians arose in the Eastern and Western Church to expound and defend Mary's prerogatives and to promulgate devotion to her. Thus, in the East we find St. Modestus of Jerusalem, St. Andrew of Crete, St. Germanus of Constantinople, St. John Damascene, St. Joseph the Hymnographer and many others. In the West we find St. Gregory the Great, St. Gregory of Tours, St. Ildephonse of Toledo, St. Martin, St. Ambrose of Milan, St. Peter Damian, Fulbert of Chartres and others.

With so many noteworthy defenders of the most singular dignity of Mary and of her eminent prerogatives, it is not surprising that her cult was greatly developed, as is evident not only from the artists, painters and sculptors who dedicated their artistry to the service of the Virgin, but from the feasts instituted in her honor and the many churches dedicated to her, especially during the time of Justinian. In the sixth and seventh centuries there were four feasts of Mary: the Purification, the Annunciation, the Dormition or Assumption and her Nativity.

The Purification of the Blessed Virgin, called by the Greeks *Hypapante Domini,* was celebrated in the East long before this time, as is evident in the narration of the Spanish monk Silvia, who in the year

traveled as a pilgrim to the holy places. This feast was celebrated in the Eastern Church and the Ambrosian Church as a feast of the Lord, but in the Roman Church it was a feast of the Blessed Virgin. According to Silvia, it was celebrated in Jerusalem at the end of the fourth century, from which it spread to Antioch and to Constantinople, and in the latter city it took on the character of a Marian feast. Finally, in the middle of the seventh century, it was extended throughout the East. It is not known for certain when this feast originated in the Roman Church. John of Carthagena believes that it probably goes back to apostolic times, or very soon after. Nevertheless, the first mention of it is made in the *Pontifical,* where it is stated that Pope Sergius I decreed that on the feasts of the Annunciation of the Lord, of the death and nativity of the Holy Mother of God, and of holy Simeon (which the Greeks called *Hypapante)* the people should go in procession from St. Adrian to St. Mary's, singing the litany. But actually, Pope Sergius was not the first to prescribe the procession. He was merely commanding that the procession be held in the manner prescribed by the Roman *Ordo.*[2*] Finally, that this feast in the Roman Church was primarily a Marian feast is demonstrated by the *Gregorian Antiphonary,* which still preserves the antiphon which was formerly sung in procession, and also by the Office for that feast and the Offertory and Postcommunion *of* the Mass of the Purification.

In the Feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, two mysteries, intimately related, were commemorated: the Incarnation of the Word of God and the divine maternity of Mar)'. This is the reason for the variety of names by which this feast was designated, for example, the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Annunciation of Holy Mar}', the Good Annunciation of the Most Blessed Mother of God, Annunciation of the Lord Jesus, etc. In the Ambrosian liturgy the Annunciation was considered a feast of our Lord. Tin's is also the opinion of Beleth.-'5 But the faithful in general intended by this feast to honor the most Blessed Virgin Mary, raised to the dignity of the Mother *of God.*

Writers are not agreed on the exact date that this feast began to be celebrated. According to Bollandus, it is of apostolic institution, but there is no trace of it whatsoever in the primitive Church.[3*] The first mention of this day is found in the Tenth Council of Toledo

(665), but in reality' the Council presupposes that the feast was already instituted, since it merely decreed that the feast should be celebrated in Spain and be considered one of the most solemn Marian feasts. It is believed that even if Spain did celebrate this feast some time before the Council, that it was not much before the beginning of the seventh century.27

The Feast of the Assumption of Mary was already celebrated in the Eastern Church in the middle of the fifth century', because the Monophysites and the Ncstorians, who separated from the Church at that time, celebrated this feast, and it is not likely that they would have adopted it after their separation from the Church. Toward the middle of the sixth century the Orientals fixed this feast for January 18, and Emperor Mauritius later transferred it to August 15. But it is very probable that in the West, and particularly in Rome, the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin was celebrated in the fifth century. It was certainly celebrated at Rome by the year 650, in Rome on August 15, and from then on it was always celebrated on that day.28 St. Gregory of Tours asserts that it was solemnly celebrated in Gaul in the sixth century'. That it was celebrated in Spain in the seventh century is proved by the *Antiphonary of the Cathedral of Leôn* and the *Liber Comitis,* of the Convent of St. Millan. The solemnity with which this feast was celebrated in Spain is evident from the *Codex Missarum* S. *lldephonsi,* which contains the Mass of the Assumption; the Vita S. *lldephonsi,* written by Bishop Cixila in the years 774-785; the Mozaabic Liturgy; the *Sermo S. Martini Legionensis.*

As regards the Feast of Mary's Nativity, writers disagree on its date of origin. Some assert that it began in the days of St. Augustine, but unreasonably so, since St. Augustine himself stated that the Church does not celebrate the birth of any of the prophets or apostles, but celebrates only two births: that of St. John the Baptist and that of Christ.29

Thomassin believes that the Nativity of Mary was not yet celebrated by the ninth century, but he was mistaken, because many ecclesiastical writers, such as Venerable Bede, St. Ildephonse of Toledo, Pope Sergius 1, and others, mention the feast before that time.30 Still other writers affirm that the feast was instituted around the time of the Council of Ephesus and Chalcedon.

It is more probable that this feast began in the East in the sixth

century; it was certainly celebrated in the seventh century, since in the following century there are many homilies on the feast by St. Andrew of Crete, John of Euboea, St. John Damascene and others.*' In the West, as we have seen, it was celebrated in the time of Pope Sergius I, and then passed on to other countries such as England, France and Spain.32 By the ninth century Pachasius Radbertus could write: "The glorious nativity of Mary is also preached in the entire Catholic Church." 33

By the twelfth century Mariological doctrine had been expounded in all its basic elements. The theologians of this period were not occupied so much in developing it as in explaining it scientifically. Outstanding among these theologians is St. Anselm, who gathered the evidence from antiquity for belief in Mary's divine maternity and her cooperation in the work of redemption and then expressed it in new formulas. Likewise distinguished in this regard were Anselm's disciple and friend, Eadmer; St. Bernard, whose Mariological doctrine was on the lips of most of the medieval theologians; St. Albert the Great, St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, Conrad of Saxony, the Abbot Gucrricus, Amadeus of Lausanne, Arnold of Chartres, St. Antoninus of Florence and many others already quoted in the pages of this book.

At the same time that Mariological doctrine unfolded and was scientifically explained by the theologians, the cult of the Most Blessed Virgin increased, with more feasts and practices of devotion. Thus, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, which had begun to be celebrated in some churches of the East in the seventh century and in the West in the ninth century, having passed through various vicissitudes, was greatly diffused during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in other regions of the East; the Feast of the Visitation of the Virgin, celebrated throughout Gaul in the thirteenth century, was extended to the whole Church in the fourteenth century; the Feast of the Presentation, celebrated in the Oriental Church in the seventh century, passed to the West in the fourteenth century; the Feast of the Betrothal, for whose institution Gerson, an ardent client of St. Joseph, worked with great enthusiasm in the fourteenth century; and the Feast of the Seven Dolors of the Blessed Virgin Mary, instituted primarily by the Provincial Synod of Cologne in the year 1423, to oppose the Hussites, who burned every representation of the Cruci-

fied Redeemer and of the Virgin of Sorrows, soon spread through Germany. Scotland and other countries, and especially throughout Spain, where the Dolors of the Most Blessed Virgin at the foot of the Cross were venerated with tender compassion.[84]

Moreover, at this time were introduced many pious formulas of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, such as the Litany of Loreto and the Rosary in the twelfth century; the Marian Scapular in the thirteenth century'; the *Angelus* in the fourteenth century. Tlie origin of the *Angelus* is not certain. It is mentioned for the first time at the General Chapter of the Friars Minor in the year 1263, and the devotion was recommended and enriched with indulgences by Pope John XXII in 1318. By the middle of the fifteenth century, it was a universal practice in the Church, as is recorded by St. Antoninus.[85]

At this time also many Confraternities were established under the title and protection of the most Blessed Virgin, and the faithful made so many pilgrimages to Marian shrines that in the thirteenth century there were approximately ten thousand churches dedicated to Mary in the Catholic world.[38]

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, devotion to Mary was violently attacked by the Protestants and Jansenists. Erasmus was their forerunner, condemning immoderately the abuses which the piety' of the people, in his opinion, had introduced into Marian cult. He ridiculed many Marian titles which had contributed to filial love and confidence in Mary, but on the other hand, he sometimes praised Mary in such a way that he seemed most zealous for her honor and cult.[87]

The Protestants, while they acknowledged the dignity and principal privileges of the Blessed Virgin, attacked the cult tendered her, considering it to be injurious to Christ. The Jansenists too, under the specious pretext of defending the cult due God, greatly lessened Mary's cult. Even Muratori spoke indiscreetly about the devotion of the faithful to Mary. These attacks of the Protestants and Jansenists were often effective, with the result that the piety of the faithful became cool in some regions.[88] But God saw to it that at this time there would arise most eminent defenders who would confront the enemies of Mary and vindicate her cult. Tlie following deserve special mention: St. Peter Canisius, St. Robert Bellarmine, St. Francis de Sales, St. Lawrence Brindisi, St. John Eudes, St. Louis Mary Grignion

de Montfort, St. Alphonsus Liguori, Salmcrôn, Suârez, Novatus, Van Ketwigh, George of Rhodes, Benedict Piazza, D'Argentân, Bossuet, Bourdalouc, Crasset, Segneri, Boudon, Poire, Arias, Fonseca, Murillo, Ribadencyra and many others.

Happily, and by the disposition of divine providence, the attacks of Mary's enemies were overpowered. Cult and devotion to Mary grew and blossomed extraordinarily; her most singular dignity and remarkable privileges were made clearer and were better understood daily in the light of Marian encyclicals and addresses by the Sovereign Pontiffs, especially by those written from the time of Pope Pius IX up to the present Sovereign Pontiff. Not only have these modem popes promulgated the true Mariological doctrine, but they have aroused theologians to study it more profoundly and have exhorted the faithful to unite themselves more and more to the divine Mother, to honor her, to love her and to imitate her virtues more faithfully.

CHAPTER NINE

Practices of ^Marian Devotion

*

There are various forms of devotion by which the faithful honor Mary; too many, in fact, for us to discuss here. We shall therefore treat briefly of the most excellent and most universal Marian devotions, namely, the Scapular and the Rosary.

The Marian Scapular

The word scapular comes from the Latin word *scapulae,* meaning shoulders, and in its widest sense it signifies the back, or the part of the human body opposite the chest. In a stricter sense it means the monastic apparel worn by the primitive Benedictines in manual labor to prevent the religious habit from becoming soiled. That is also a possible reason why the scapulars of the Trappists and the Dominican laybrothers are black. Later, the scapular became part of a knight's apparel, worn over his suit of armor and bearing the colors of his liege.

However, this word has a more special meaning in another sense, referring to the Carmelite Scapular, which was given by the Blessed Virgin to St. Simon Stock, the Prior General of the Carmelites.

History of the Marian Scapular. It is said that in the middle of the thirteenth century, St. Simon Stock received the Marian Scapular from the Blessed Virgin herself. Towards the year 1245 he was elected Prior General of the Carmelite Order, and he asked the Virgin, of whom he was a most fervent client, to give him a proof of her love and protection of the Carmelite Order. Mary kindly consented to such humble supplications. While he was in London, in the year 1261 (according to some writers, in 1251), St. Simon was favored by a vision of the Blessed Virgin, who, surrounded by numerous angels

and shining with the splendors of heaven, promised him and his religious institute a unique benevolence and protection. Then, as a pledge, she gave him the Scapular of the Order, saying: "Receive, my beloved son, this Scapular of thy Order, the badge of my confraternity, a privilege granted to thee and to all Carmelites. Whoever dies clothed with it will not suffer eternal flames."

There has been much discussion concerning the authenticity of the Marian Scapular. Its principal objector was John Launoy, who asserted that no contemporary writer of St. Simon's time mentions the vision. He therefore concludes that the event was something invented ata later period. In our times Thurston, Boudinhon, Saltet and others have denied the authenticity of the vision.[1]

Nevertheless, the heavenly origin of the Scapular and of the vision of St. Simon Stock is attested by Peter Swingthons (or Swanington), his companion and secretary, who affirms that he himself heard the story of the heavenly vision from the lips of Simon himself and that he wrote what the man of God had dictated. It was likewise defended by the General of the Carmelite Order, John Grossi, in the year 1389; by Paleonidorus, in the year 1475; by John Cheron and Papebroech, S.J., who, in his answer to Sebastian of St. Paul, declares that he found nothing in that vision which would have to be rejected, after having read what Swingthons and Pope Benedict XIV had written.[2] Lastly, the liturgy proclaims the authenticity of the Scapular vision by including the account in lesson V at Matins *for the* Feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel.

Privileges of the Marian Scapular. The outstanding privilege *of* the Scapular is contained in the promise that anyone who dies wearing the Scapular will not suffer eternal fire. How is this promise to be understood? In the first place, it would be erroneous to maintain that the mere fact of wearing the Scapular at the moment of death will automatically preserve one from eternal damnation. It is *de fide* that no one can know for certain whether he will be saved and, moreover, final perseverance is a special gift.[3]

Lezama and Sylveira maintain that the words, "will not suffer eternal fire," refer to the flames of purgatory, and signify that those who wear the Scapular will not be in purgatory for a long time. "Eternal" is thus interpreted in *a wide* sense? However, it seems more accurate to say that the exemption from eternal fire, promised to

those who wear the Scapular, is to be understood literally as referring to the fires of hell, and that those who wear the Scapular will avoid eternal damnation, but on the condition that they fulfill the other conditions which are normally required for salvation.

St. Robert Bellarmine states that Sacred Scripture frequently attributes the power of justification and even of salvation to some object, not because the article alone can justify or save, but because it possesses the power of so doing as long as the necessary conditions are present.®

Pope Benedict XIV declared that the promise must not be understood as meaning that anyone who wears the Scapular will by that fact alone be preserved from the sufferings of hell, for other good works are also commanded, and among them is that one should always persevere. Bearing in mind the words of the promise, the faithful should make certain their election by good works and by never despairing. They should always give thanks and pray without ceasing so that the promise may be fulfilled to the glory of the Most Holy Trinity and the ever blessed Virgin Mary.0

However, one should not conclude that the Carmelite Scapular confers no real privilege on those who wear it, because a Christian who fulfills the necessary conditions can be saved even if he never wears the Scapular. The Carmelite Scapular bestows great privileges on those who wear it, since it is a sign of the singular protection of Mary and a pledge of the abundant grace which she will obtain for her clients if they observe the commandments and live piously. If they arc in sin, they will do penance; if they arc in the state of grace, they will persevere in it and thus obtain eternal beatitude. But this should be understood in the sense that the Blessed Virgin will do her part and will intercede for those who wear her Scapular, as long as they do not place any obstacle to her help. For even those who wear the Scapular are still free and can therefore frustrate the Scapular promise.7

The other privilege attached to the Marian Scapular is the Sabbatine indulgence, or the liberation of the wearers of the Scapular from the pains of purgatory on the first Saturday after their death. This privilege is contained in the Bull of Pope John XXII and it reads: "I, the Mother of grace, will descend to purgatory on the Saturday after their death and I will liberate all those whom I find

there and lead them to the holy mount of eternal life." It is said that on May J of the first year of his pontificate (according to others, it was the sixth year), as a result of a vision of the Blessed Virgin, Pope John XXII confirmed with his authority the Marian Scapular, in the pontifical document *Sacratissimo uti culmine.*9

There arc two points to be studied in this privilege: the authenticity of the Bull and the promise of saving souls from the fire of purgaton' on the first Saturday after their death. As regards the authenticity of the Bull, a great controversy arose and it has not yet been settled. The document was defended as genuine by Theophilus Raynaud, and in our days by Besalduch.®

Bitterly opposed to the authenticity of the Bull was Launoy, followed by Papebroech. Zimmerman and Hilgers also reject it as spurious.10 But regardless of the authenticity of the Bull of Pope John XXII, it is not licit to doubt the Sabbatine privilege, since it has been recognized and approved by so many of the Sovereign Pontiffs.11

Moreover, when at the end of the sixteenth century, disputes arose over this privilege, in Spain and in Portugal, the inquisitor general, Peter Castillo, forbade the Carmelites to preach that privilege. Then, in 1613, Pope Paul V, by a decree of the Holy Inquisition, permitted tiie Cannelite Fathers to preach that Christian people may piously believe that the Blessed Virgin will help the wearers of the Scapular by her continual intercession, her merits, and her special protection after their death, especially on Saturdays, the day consecrated to her by the Church.12

Pope St. Pius X mentions the Sabbatine privilege,13 *and in a letter to* the Most Reverend Father Elias, Prior General of the Cannelites, on March 18, 1922, Pope Pius XI spoke favorably of the Sabbatine privilege. Another letter *afErming the Sabbatine privilege was sent* by Pope Pius XI to the same Prior General on December 4, 1922.1* Lastly, the conditions for gaining this privilege are also enumerated in the Roman Breviary, in Matins for the Feast of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel. For that reason, Papebroech asserted that it would be foolish to deny that devotion to the Scapular has been highly indulgenced and approved *by* the Roman Pontiffs and verified *by* countless divine benefits.10

With regard to Mary's promise, as contained in the Bull, three

things were promised by her: 1) her descent to purgatory ("I, the Mother of grace, will descend on the Saturday after their death"); 2) pardon from punishment and guilt at the moment of death ("Therefore, the professed brethren of said Order will be absolved from punishment and guilt, and this on the day that they leave this world"); 3) liberation from purgatory on the first Saturday after their death ("I, the Mother of grace, will descend on the Saturday after their death and I will liberate all those whom I find there and lead them to the holy mount of eternal life").

The descent of the Blessed Virgin to purgatory must not be understood to mean that she leaves her glorious throne in heaven on each Saturday and descends to purgatory personally, but that she is there by a virtual presence, that is, by her intercession or help, by which she assists these souls in purgatory. Although Mary does not go personally into purgatory, nevertheless, she must be there by the presence of her power, by her most efficacious intercession for the souls in purgatory. Pope Paul V therefore prohibited all paintings or pictures which represented Mary as descending bodily to purgatory to lead forth the souls of her clients. And truly, it would not be very much in harmony with the state of beatitude for the Blessed Virgin to be obliged to descend from heaven so frequently to enter the prisons of purgatory.

As regards the pardon of punishment and guilt at the moment of death, it is not to be understood as the pardon of a mortal or venial sin. There can be no pardon of mortal or venial sin unless the necessary dispositions are present in the sinner who seeks forgiveness. Moreover, the usual requisites for the pardon of mortal sin arc contrition, confession and purpose of amendment.

Therefore, it must be affirmed that this indulgence, like any other, is granted for the remission of punishment due to sin and not for the sin itself.[18] As a promise for the forgiveness of sin, it could only mean that the Blessed Virgin would impetrate the grace needed to arouse tire sinner to repentance.

Regarding the promise that the soul would be liberated from purgatory on the Saturday after death, if the soul is granted a plenary indulgence at tire moment of death, it will not be detained in purgatory even for a moment, but it will go straight to heaven. It is *de fide* that the soul of any person in whom nothing remains to be paid,

as happens in the case of one who gains the plenary indulgence, goes immediately to heaven." Nevertheless, neither of the two promises nullifies the other, but they complement each other, since to the benefit of this indulgence the Blessed Virgin adds a new favor, in case the indulgence is frustrated because of some imperfection or defect.

Not all those who believe they have obtained the plenary indulgence really gain it, for frequently there may be defects which invalidate it; otherwise, there would be no reason for celebrating Masses or giving alms as suffrages for the dead who seemed to have left this world fortified by a plenary indulgence. Hence, the Blessed Virgin promises to free, on the first Saturday after his or her death, the member of the Confraternity who is not freed from purgatory because the plenary indulgence was not obtained. However "the first Saturday after death" is not to be taken in a strict sense, but in a wide sense, although Saturday is the day dedicated to the most Blessed Virgin from earliest times.

For that reason Pope Paul V states that the Blessed Virgin, by her intercession, merits and special protection, will help the members of the Confraternity who die in charity, and that on Saturdays, the day consecrated by the Church to her, she will help them in a particular manner.[18] The Roman Breviary states that the Blessed Virgin will console the members of the Confraternity while they are being purified in purgatory and she will speedily conduct them to heaven." Pope Benedict XIV commented on that statement by saying that this is a pious belief.[20]

Understood in this sense, the Sabbatine privilege is admitted by all, even by Launoy, who criticized certain aspects of the Scapular devotion, but affirmed that he considered that this privilege may be piously believed.[21]

The Rosary

Another kind of *devotion most acceptable to the most Blessed Virgin, and which the faithful hold in high* regard and practice everywhere, is that of the *most holy* Rosary'.

Nature of the Rosary. The Rosary is a form of prayer composed of fifteen decades of Hail Mary's, each decade introduced by an Our Father, with a particular mystery of the lives of Christ and Mary proposed for meditation during the recitation of each of the fifteen decades. Therefore, there arc three essential parts of the Rosary: the mysteries, the Our Father and the Hail Mary.

Although many Our Fathers and Hail Marys are recited, there is no Rosary without meditation on the mysteries; nor can meditation on the mysteries without the Our Fathers and Hail Marys be called the Rosary.[22]

As to other prayers added to the Rosary before or after the announcing of the mysteries, these do not pertain to the essence of the Rosary'. They are free and variable parts which follow the particular custom of a region or nation.

The mysteries are certain passages of the Gospel which refer to the principal facts in the lives of Jesus and Mary. They are historical facts which happened in Palestine, where the work of human redemption took place, but they are called mysteries because, under the veil of history, they contain truths incomprehensible to our reason, such as the incarnation of the Word, the divine maternity, and so on, which surpass human understanding and can be known only by revelation.

The fifteen mysteries recall to us the joyful, sorrowful and glorious events in the lives of Jesus and Mary. Although not all of the mysteries are immediate and formal acts of the Blessed Virgin, they concern her own Son, and thus they intimately affect the Mother also.[23]

The Lord's Prayer is the prayer that Christ our Redeemer taught His disciples when they asked Him: "Lord, teach us to pray" (Luke 11:i). Durandus states that it surpasses all other prayers by reason of Him who taught it, by reason of its succinctness, by reason of its petitions and by reason of the great mysteries it contains.[24]

For that reason, from the early centuries of the Church, the Lord's Prayer was the principal part of public cult and it flows through all of the liturgies. The custom of joining this prayer to the Hail Mary existed at the close of the tenth century, and when placed at the beginning of each decade, it becomes a powerful petition which we direct to the heavenly Father through the hands of the Blessed Virgin, so that through such an excellent mediatrix we may obtain what we could not attain through our own merits.

The Hail Mary is so called because of the two words with which it begins. It is called the *angelic salutation* because it comprises the greeting of the Archangel Gabriel, announcing to Mary the mystery of the Incarnation which was to be fulfilled in her. To the angelic salutation to Mary, full of grace and blessed among all women, through the blessed fruit of her womb, is added a prayer which asks her to help us now and at the hour of our death.

The prayer consists of two parts. The first contains the salutation of the Angel Gabriel, sent by God to announce to Mary the mystery of the Incarnation: "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women" (Luke 1:28), and the testimony of St. Elizabeth, who, when visited by Mary, was inspired by the Holy Spirit to exclaim: "Blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb" (Luke 1:42).

The second part of the prayer is directed to the Blessed Virgin herself, asking her to guide us both in life and in death: "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us, sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen."

The prayer was not composed all at once, but it evolved gradually. In the first part we find two additions: the name of Mary, which is inserted between "Hail" and "full of grace"; and the name of Jesus, placed after the words "fruit of thy womb."

Concerning the addition of the name of Mary, St. Thomas says that the first part (Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women) is attributed to the angel. The second part (Blessed is the fruit of thy womb) traces its origin to Elizabeth, the mother of the Baptist. The third part is that of the Church, that is, the word *Mary.*[28]

That this addition is most ancient in the Church is proved by the *Gregorian Antiphonary,* because for the Fourth Sunday of Advent it directs that the words, "Hail, Mary, full *of* grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women, Alleluia," be said. These words are likewise read in other old antiphonaries, as also in the Offertory of the Votive Mass of the Virgin, and are attributed to Alcuin.[29]

On the addition of the name *of Jesus,* the following is to be noted. This name was introduced into the angelic salutation very much later, because it does not figure in the *Expositio salutationis angelicae of St.* Thomas nor in the *Speculum B. Virginis, lec.* 1. Nevertheless, it

was already used by Amadeus of Lausanne, who concluded his third homily on the praises of the Blessed Virgin in this way: "Hail, full of grace; the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus Christ, who is, above all things, God, blessed for ever and ever. Amen." However, these words seem to have been said more as the conclusion of a sermon than as a formula of prayer.

The addition of the name of Jesus was probably ordered by Pope Urban IV around the year 1262, when he enriched the prayer with an indulgence of thirty days. This is attested, among the ancients, by Henry of Langenstein, Michael of Insulis and Thomas à Kempis, and among the modems, by Mabillon, Esser, Beisel and others.[27]

The second part of the prayer (Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us, sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen.) is of ancient usage. It is believed that the faithful, from the time of the Council of Ephesus, were accustomed to add it to the first part of the Hail Mary. Such is the opinion of Cardinal Baronius, Cardinal Bona, and many others, who also assert that the Hail Mary was already established in ancient times in its present form.[28]

But today most writers are opposed to this opinion, and rightly so, because only after many centuries was this second part added to the prayer. Although there are traces in St. John Damascene and in St. Andrew of Crete of certain beginnings of the custom of uniting to the Hail Mary a more or less explicit petition for the help of Mary,[2*] nevertheless, it is certain that only after some centuries was the invocation of the second part introduced expressly, and none of them existed before the 12th century.

Thus, the words "Holy Mary, pray for us" are read for the first time in the Carthusian breviary of the thirteenth century. Tire words "pray for us, sinners. Amen" arc found in another breviary of the fourteenth century, in St. Bernardine of Siena and in certain hymns of the fifteenth century.[80]

Tire words "now and at the hour of our death. Amen," were not used in Spain, according to Martin of Azpilcueta (Navarra);[81] and in the year 1460, the form used was: "Hail, Mary, full of grace. The Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women and blessed is thy mother and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Virgin Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners. Amen." [82]

However, the words were used in Rome and in other places. Thus, Berthold, the Archbishop of Mcntz, decreed in 1493 that the angelic salutation should end in this way in parochial ceremonies on Sundays.8' The same words are found in a *Codex* edited by St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, and in the *Collection of Christian Praises,* in Venice, in the year 1477. Trombclli then adds that in the Roman Breviary of the fourteenth century, or perhaps in the beginning of the fifteenth, the angelic salutation appears almost the same as that in use today.34

For this reason Navarrus writes that the custom of Rome, approved by the Roman Breviary of Pope Pius V, made the words "now and at the hour of our death" part of the Hail Mary when said in the canonical hours by those obliged to recite them.'' By the eighteenth century, every other formula was abolished, and henceforth the angelic salutation underwent no change or addition whatever.

Origin of the Rosary. Many controversies have arisen, principally in our times, about the origin and institution of the Rosary, but it is not our intention to discuss them here. It is certain that contemporary documents are wanting which attest to the origin of the Rosary, but in conformity with an ancient and venerable tradition, it was instituted, under the inspiration of the Blessed Virgin, by St. Dominic Guzman, although perhaps not entirely in the same form which it has today.30

The Albigensian heresy, bitterly opposed to the Mother of God, had taken strong hold in the area of Toulouse, in France. St. Dominic, who had recently founded the Order of Preachers, dedicated himself completely to combat and destroy it. In order to succeed more efficaciously, he implored the help of Mary with the most fervent prayers. Advised by her, as tradition states, to preach the Rosary to the people as a most unique defense against the heretics, the fervor and success of the mission entrusted to him were truly astonishing.

This venerable tradition has been confirmed by many Roman Pontiffs, who attributed to St. Dominic the institution of the Rosary, as is evident from the testimony of Pope Benedict XIV. He, in turn, referred to the testimony of *Pope Leo X, Pope* Pius VII, Pope Gregory XIII, Pope Sixtus V, Pope Clement VIII, Pope Alexander VI, Pope Innocent XIII, and others who unanimously attribute the institution of the Rosary to St. Dominic.''

The same teaching was promulgated by Pope Pius IX and especially by Pope Leo XIII, who speaks thus:

> There is none among you, Venerable Brethren, who will not remember how great trouble and grief God's holy Church suffered from the Albigensian heretics, who evolved from the sect of the later Manichacans, and who filled the south of France and other portions of the Latin world with their pernicious errors, and carrying everywhere the terror of their arms, strove far and wide to rule by massacre and ruin. Our merciful God, as you know, raised up against these most direful enemies a most holy man, the illustrious parent and founder of the Dominican Order. Great in the integrity of his doctrine, in his example of virtue, and by his apostolic labors, he dauntlessly proceeded to attack the enemies of the Catholic Church, not by force of arms, but by complete trust to that devotion which he was the first to institute under the name of the Holy Rosary, which was disseminated through the length and breadth of the earth by him and his followers.
>
> Guided, in fact, by divine inspiration and grace, he foresaw that this devotion, like a most powerful warlike weapon, would be the means of putting the enemy to flight, and of confounding their audacity and mad impiety. Such was indeed its result.38

Several years after the death of St. Dominic, the recitation of the Rosary, although fervently received in the beginning, gradually fell away because of the horrible pestilences which destroyed most of Europe, because of the deplorable Western Schism which had so long divided the Church, and for other reasons. Then, through the labors of Blessed Alan of Rupe, with the determined help of his brothers of the Order of Preachers, its use blossomed anew and spread with rapidity throughout the world.

Our Blessed Mother favored these labors greatly when, according to tradition, in 1470 she appeared to Father Jacob Springer, Prior of the Convent of St. Dominic in Cologne. She commanded him to teach the people in his sermons, how pleasing to God and how salutary to all is this devotion to the Rosary. From that time on, this devotion has never faltered; rather, it has become almost liturgical and was recommended by many Sovereign Pontiffs. It has always enjoyed the first place among the forms of honoring Mary. The Dominicans were given the special mission of propagating the Rosary

as a precious inheritance, and it is in large part due to their ardent zeal that even in our days this Christian devotion continues to be universally practiced by the faithful.

Excellence of the Rosary, lire dignity and excellence of the Rosary and its acceptance by the Blessed Virgin are clearly shown by Pope Leo XIII when he says: "Now, among the various practices and forms of paying honor to the Blessed Virgin, some are to be prefened, inasmuch as we know them to be most powerful and most pleasing to our Mother; and for this reason We specially mention by name and recommend the Rosary." 39

Pope Pius XI writes: "Among the various supplications with which we successfully appeal to the Virgin Mother of God, the holy Rosary without doubt occupies a special and distinct place." *°

The Virgin Mary herself recommended this formula of prayer when, in the year 1855, sbe appeared at Lourdes and taught a mere child, by her own example, to recite it. At the vision at Fatima, she explicitly asked for the recitation of the Rosary.

Finally, what delightful fruit, what consolation and comfort the Christians obtained in their anxieties by their frequent and devout recitation of the Rosary, as is also the case in the present; how many dangers have been overcome and favors obtained, are evident both from ancient and modem history. Thus, Pope Leo XIII reminds us that by the power of the most holy Rosary, the evils of the Albigenses, which had filled the south of France and other regions of the Latin world with pernicious errors, were destroyed. He also recalls the naval victory obtained through the efficacy of this same prayer in the battle against the Turks, who in the sixteenth century were intent on imposing on all of Europe the yoke *of* superstition and barbarism. He mentions another victory in the previous century, once at Temesvar in Hungary, and the other on the island of Corfu, "and in both cases these engagements coincided with feasts of the Blessed Virgin and with the conclusion of public devotions of the Rosary." 41

Pope Pius XI says: "The holy Virgin who once victoriously drove the terrible sect of the Albigenses from Christian countries, now suppliantly invoked by us, will tum aside the new errors, especially those of Communism, which reminds us in many ways, in *its motives* and misdeeds, of the ancient ones.

"And as in the times of the crusades in all Europe there was raised

one voice of the people, one supplication, so it is today. Throughout the world, in the cities and smallest villages, people who arc one in courage and resoluteness eagerly implore the great Mother of God that the enemies of Christian and human civilization be overthrown and that true peace may shine on the tired and anxious hearts of men." 48

Moreover, how much the Marian Rosary has contributed in promoting piety among the faithful, in exciting virtue and in strengthening them, appears from the very interior disposition of the Rosary; that is, from the very celestial flowers with which this mystical crown is interwoven: the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary and meditation on the mysteries, by which the joys, the sorrows and the triumphs of Jesus and of His Mother arc placed before our eyes.

The principal mysteries of our religion which nourish and sustain our faith are recalled to mind; at the same time our minds are elevated to the divinely revealed truths which strengthen our hope, since the triumph of Jesus Christ and His Mother on which we meditate in the last part, present heaven opened to us, and invite us to the conquest of heaven. Charity is inflamed by the consideration of the great and intense sufferings endured by the dying Christ and by Mary's compassion with Him, for the redemption and salvation of mankind.

In the Rosary, the Lord's Prayer, the most excellent of all prayers, composed and taught personally by the Redeemer, is said. In it is contained all that is holy and beneficial, all that we could possibly ask for or desire, both for soul and body.

Lastly, the angelic salutation is said, which, beginning with the praise of St. Gabriel the Archangel and St. Elizabeth, ends in that most pious supplication in which we ask the Blessed Virgin to help us, now and at the hour of our death.

This is the prayer of the Most Holy Rosary, so profound in mysteries, so eminent in dignity, so efficacious in value, so rich in esteem, so sweet in love, so gentle in consolations, so fertile in merit, so wondrous in prodigies, so easy to the simple, so delightful to the learned, and so sweet to the perfect. It is a special prayer which we address to the most Holy Virgin, so that she will intercede for us before the throne of God and obtain for us the grace of pleasing her in this life and of enjoying her eternally in heaven.

PRACTICES OF MARIAN DEVOTION

We terminate this treatise on the Blessed Virgin by quoting the tender entreaty with which we terminate the Rosary:

Hail, holy Queen, Mother of mercy; hail, our life, our sweetness, and our hope. To Thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve. To Thee do we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this vale of tears. Turn, then, most gracious advocate, thine eyes of mercy towards us; *and after this our exile, show unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus. O clement, O loving, O sweet Virgin Mary!*

Translators Bibliography

Ancient Christian Writers: *Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1946).

Ante-Nicene Fathers, Authorized Edition (New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1899)

Bible, New Catholic Edition (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1949).

de Sales, St. Francis, *Treatise on the Love of God,* 3rd cd. (London: Burns and Oates, 1884).

Doheny, Wm. J., *Papal Documents on Mary* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1954).

Dominican Missal, English Dominican Fathers.

Dominican Sisters' Office Book (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1942).

Gardeil, A., *The Gifts of the Holy Ghost in the Dominican Saints* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1937).

Kelly, T., Life *of the Blessed Virgin,* translated from the Italian of Romuald Gentilucci (New York: 17 Barclay St., 1878).

Liguori, St. Alphonsus, *The Glories of Mary* (St. Louis: Redemptorist Fathers, 1931).

Newman, J. H., *The New Eve* (Great Britain: Samuel Walker, 1952).

Palmer, Paul, S.J., *Mary in the Documents of the Church* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1952).

Philipon, M., O.P., *The Mother of God* (Westminster; Md.: Newman Press, 1953).

Pohle-Preuss, *Christology* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1916).

Pohle-Preuss, *Mariology* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1948).

Pohle-Preuss, *Soteriology* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1914).

Scheeben, M. J., *Mariology* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1946).

Schroeder, H. J., O.P., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1941).

Shecd, F. J., *The Mary Book* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1950).

St. *Andrew Missal* (St. Paul: E. M. Lohman).

St. Thomas, *Summa Contra Gentiles,* trans. English Dominicans (New York: Benziger Bros., 1928).

St. Thomas, *Summa theologica,* trans. English Dominicans (New York: Benziger Bros., 1948).

Notes

CHAPTER ONE

'*Suprem. apostol.,* September i, 1883.

'*Ubi primum,* February 2, 1849.

'*Fidentem piumque,* September 20, 1896.

'Ad *diem ilium,* February 2, 1904.

'*Ineffabilis Deus,* December 8, 1854.

*Serm. *In Nativitate Domini.*

'Serm. 140.

'*Or. in Deiparae Assumpt.*

*Cf. Hover, *"Maria hominum Corredemptrix," Cregorianum,* December, 1925.

"*Sermo 8 in Signum Magnum.*

ll *Jucunda semper,* September 8, 1894.

u De *Alma Soda Christi Mediatoris,* sect. I, cap. 4.

CHAPTER TWO

l Cf. Denz. 993.

'Serm. 176.

'Denz. ygo.

'*Summa theol.,* Illa, q.46, a. 2.

'Cf. *In III Sent.,* dist. 20, a. 1, q. 5.

'*Ad diem ilium,* February a, 1904.

'*Haer.,* 68.

'*De Symb. ad catechum.,* c. 4.

'Cf. *Serm. de Nativitate B.M.V.*

"*Serm. de Natali Domini.*

"*De virg. perpetua Deip. Mariae,* c. 12.

" Cf. Richard *of* St. Lawrence, *De laud. E. Virg.,* VI; Denis the Carthusian, De *praeconio BM.V., Il,* 9.

''Cf. Hymn at Lauds, Common of the Blessed Virgin.

"Serm. 1, *De Assumpt. Virg. Cf.* also Gariu, *Deipara Elucidate, 11, 3.*

"*Octobri mense,* September 22, 1892.

"*Fidentem,* September 20, 1896.

ll *Dial. cum Thryphone.*

"*Adv. Haer., Ill,* 22.

"*De cam. Christi,* c. 17.

"*Catech. 12 de Christo Inc.*

" Cf. St. Augustine, *De agone Christi, c.* 22; St. Peter Chrysologus. *Serm.* 142, *In Annunt. BM.V.*

"*Hom.* 4, *Super Missus est; cf.* St. Ambrose, *Epist.,* Lib. IV, who says that Mary effected the salvation of the world by conceiving the Redeemer of all.

"*In Luc., c.* 1; cf. also Denis the Carthusian, *Da laud. glor. Virg. Mariae,* II, a. ay.

''Bainvel, *Maria Mira de grâce.*

"*St. Peter* Canisius, *De Maria Virgine, IV,* c. ay.

"*De festis B.M. Virginis,* c. 4.

"*Cf. De la* Broisse and Bainvel, *Marie Mère da grâce, Inhod.; De la* Taille, *"La médiatrice de toutes les grâces," Gregorianum. VU, fisc.* 3, September, 1926; *Ude, 1st Maria die Mittlerin aller Cnadcnl; Rivière, "Sur la notion do Mario médiatrice," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensas, II,* fasc. a, April, 1923; Smith, *Mary's*

Part in our Redemption, chap. 9; Lcnnerz, *"De doctrina* B.V. *Mediatricis," Gregorianum,* XIX, fasc. 3. 1938; Goossens, De *cooperatione immediata Matris Redemptoris ad redemptionem objectivant;* Philips, "De *modo cooperationis Mariae ad Redemptionem," Revue Ecclésiastique de Liège,* March, 1939.

‘‘Cf. *Maria mediadora, c.* 4.

®Cf. *Précis de Thiol. Dogmatique,* I, lib. Ill, sect. 2, append.

’’Cf. *Ep. ad Episc. Calaritanum,* January 9, 1801.

‘‘Cf. Magnae Dei *Matris,* September 8, 1802.

‘‘Cf. *Jucunda semper,* September 8, 1894.

“ Ad diem illum.

‘‘Cf. Inter *sodalitia,* March 22, 1918.

‘‘Cf. *Explorata res est,* February 2, 1923.

‘‘Cf. *L'Osservatore Romano,* April 29, 1935.

"Cf. Merkelbach, *Mariologia,* III, a. 2.

‘‘Cf. St. Ambrose, *Ep. ad Eccles. Vercellensem;* St. John Chrysostom, De *coemeterio et cruce Domini.*

"Serm. 118.

"De verbis *Domini,* Serm. 3.

*’ Arnold of Chartres, De laud. *sanctae ac perpetuae Virginis Matris Christi Mariae.*

‘‘*Cf.* Comm. *in* Joan., III.

‘‘Cf. De *praeconio et dignitate Deiparae,* III, a. 25.

‘‘Cf. De *laud.* B. Mariae, I, c. 15.

‘‘Cf. *Expos, in Passionem Domini.*

‘‘Cf. In I Sent., dist. 48, q. 2.

*’ Cf. St. Albert, De natura *boni; Mariale,* q. 29; qq. 148-50.

‘‘See Dillenschneider, La *Mariologie de S. Alphonse de Liguori, Sources et Synthèse doctrinale,* II, c. 10.

‘‘Ad diem *illum,* February 2, 1904.

‘‘De gestis *Domini Salvatoris,* II,

’’ Cf. St. Albert the Great, *Mariale,* q. 148.

" Cf. *In Luc.,* c. 1.

‘‘ Cf. Bover, *"El pensamiento generador de la teologia de San Pablo," Gregorianium,* XIX, fasc. 2, 1938.

‘‘ Cf. Sinibaldi, II *Cuore della Madré di Amore,* c. 2.

‘‘Bernard, O.P., *The Mystery of Mary,* chap. 27, p. 149.

‘‘In Luc., c. 1.

"La *Corrédemptrice,* III, *Réponses aux objections.*

‘‘Cf. Schiith, *Mediatrix. Eine Mariologische Frage;* Campana, Maria *nel Dogma Cattolico,* I, q. 1. c. 2, a. 1.

"Cf. *Die selige Jungfrau Maria, die Vermittlerin aller Gnadcn;* Bittremieux, *Ephemerides Theologicae* Lovanienses, an. II, fasc. 3, July, 1925.

‘‘ Cf. Peter de Lorca, In *III S. Thomae,* d. 22.

” Haeres., 3.

“ Summa theol., Illa, q. 79, a. 5; cf. Galtier, De *Incarn. et Redemp.,* th.

‘‘Cf. Denz. 799; Pope Leo XIII, *Tametsi futura,* November 1, 1900; *Cone. coll. Lacensis,* t. VII.

‘‘ Cf. Cajetan, In III, q. 1, a. 2.

‘‘In Rom., horn. 10.

“ Jucunda semper, September 8, 1894.

"Ad diem ilium, February 2, 1904.

‘‘Inter *sodalitia,* March 22, 1918.

" Explorata res est, February 2, 1923.

"Hom. 2 *super Missus est.*

n Cf. *Mariale,* q. 42.

"Cf. St. Basil, In Ps. 48; St. Ambrose, *In Luc., 6;* St. Augustine, *Enchir.,* c. 108; St. Fulgcnce, *Ep.* 17, *3-*

"Cf. Summa theol., Illa, q- 1, a. 2, ad 2iim.

’* Cf. Pro. *immac. Deip. Virg. Concept. defensio,* c. 21.

"Cf. In *cap.* 1. *Matth.,* observ. 15

’· Denz. 795.

n *Contra Gentes,* IV, 55.

"Cf. Maldonado, *Comm. in Joann.,*

"*Cf. Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 48, a.

‘‘Cf. Cone. *40, De Assumpt.* B.M. *Virginis.*

“ *Cf. In Cant., II, c. 26.*

“ Cf. *De mentis robore seu martyrio Beatiss. Virginis,* hom. 5.

"Cf. Bittremicux, *De mediat, univers. B. Mariae Virg. quoad gratias,*

u*De Incarn.,* dist. 5, sect. 7.

‘‘Cf. *Roman Catechism,* II, *De Poenit.,* η. III.

"St. Thomas, In III *Sent.,* dist. 18.

"*In Illam* dist. 14, a. 2; see also, Lorca, *In Illam,* dist. 22, a. 4.

"*Quodl.,* II, in resp. ad 211m and ad 311m.

"Phil. 2:8 ff.

"Heb. 5:9.

"Acts 4:12.

"Cf. Rupert of Deutz, *Cant.,* I; Ghisleri, *Comm, in Cant., c. 2,* v. 5.

“ "*La Médiatrice de toutes les grâces," Gregorianum,* Vol. VIII, fasc. 3, 1936.

"*Mary's Part in our Redemption,* e. 9.

" "*Cooperatio Mariae ad Redemptionem," Revue Ecclésiastique de Liège,* an. XXX, n. 5, Mar., 1939.

" Cf. *Litt, apost. erect, capellae ad praesepe Jesu Christi in basilica S. Mariae Majoris de Urbe,* 1587.

"*Parta humano generi,* September 8, 1901.

‘‘Ad *diem illum,* February 2, 1904.

"See Hugon, *Marie pleine de grâce,* II, c. 2; Card. Gomd, *Marta Santisima, Reina del Universo, p.* 19.

‘‘‘De *Mediatione BM.V,, Acta Ord. Fr. Minorum,* May, 1938.

'‘‘Cf. *Serm. 17, a Lovaniensibus inter Augustini germanos receptus;* Petau, *De Incarn.,* XIV, c. 9.

I‘‘Cf. *De excell. Virginis,* **c. 9.**

""Cf. *Mariait,* qq. 148-50.

*‘‘ Cf. *In 1* Sent., dist. 48, a. *2,* q. 1.

"‘‘Summa *theol.,* Illa, q. 1, a. 2, ad 2tim.

1MCf. John of St. Thomas, De *Incarnat.,* q. 1, disp. 3, a. 1.

Disp. pro Immaculata Dei *Genitr. Conceptione.*

Cf. *Summa theol.,* la Ilae, q. 114, . 6.

'"Cf. Satolli, De *gratia Christi,* q. . a. 6.

"’Cf. *Ep.* 37, *Ad Dardanium.*

1,1 Cf. De *Incarn.,* d. 5, dub. 7; cf. Bartmann, *Précis de Thêol. Dogm.,* Ill, c. 5.

‘‘In III *Sent.,* d. 13. q. 4.

‘‘In *lam Ilae S. Thom.,* q. 114, a. 7, dub. 1.

"‘Cf. Comm. *Theol.,* II, d. 8, q. 6, punct. 5.

“* Cf. S. Bini, *Concilia generalia et particularia.*

"· *Ad diem dium,* February 2, 1904.

“’Cf. *Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 8, a.

’ “* Cf. Arnold of Chartres, De *laud, sanctae ac perpetuae Virginis Matris Christi Mariae.*

•"*Cf. Hom. adv. Nestarium.*

‘‘Cf. *Horn, in Assumpt. B. Virginis.*

“•*Loc. cit.*

“› Cf. Session VI. c. 16; Denz. 810.

“· Cf. Vega, *op. cit.,* pal. 29, cert. *2.*

“ *Cf. Denz.* 826.

‘‘Cf. *Inter sodalitia,* March 22, 1918.

“‘‘Cf. *Quatuor tractatus in lam S. Thomae,* tr. 3, d. 29, c. 1.

‘‘Cf. Stentrup, *Soteriologia,* I, c. 9, sect. 4.

‘‘Scotiis lists five “instants" in God's foreknowledge and providence: first, Cod knows Himself; second. Cod knows all creatures; third. He predestines some to glory and to grace (and in the first place Christ); fourth.

He foresees the niin of all in Adam; fifth, in His divine providence God decrees a remedy in the passion of Christ. Cf. Scotus, *In III Sent.,* d. 19.

'"Cf. Suérez, *In I,* d. 41, sect. 4.

*"Cf. Lorca, *In III S. Thomae,* d. 76. n· »3.

'"Cf. Pcsch, De *Verbo Inc.,* II, sect. 3, a. 3.

■"Cf. Palmieri, De *gratia divina actuali,* th. 4-13.

'"Cf. *Deipara elucidata.*

'▮'Horn. 4, *Super Missus est.*

'"*Serm.* 51.

'"Cf. In III *Sent., d.* 18, a. 4.

"'Cf. *Mariale,* qq. 149, 169.

Cf. Gerson, *Canticord.,* tit. *2, p. 3-*

"· Cf. In *Prov.,* c. 8.

'"Cf. *Cursus theol.,* d. *2,* q. 1, a. 1.

'"*Summa theol.,* la Ilae, q. 114, a. *3-*

'·' Cf. De Civ. Dei, X, c. 6.

De Civ. Dei., X, c. 3.

Contra Gentes, III, c. »20.

Cf. Denz. 957.

'"Cf. St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Nestorium,* III.

**' Cf. St. Albert the Great, *Mariale,* q. 51.

'"Cf. Grimai, Le *Sacerdoce et le Sacrifice de N.S. Jésus-Christ,* c. 3.

"' Ad *diem ilium,* February 2, 1904.

""Cf. *Summa theol.,* Ilia, q. 48, a. 3, ad 3um.

Tummers, *"Het mede-verdienen van de h. Maagd in het verlossings-werk," Cregorianum,* XIX, fasc. 3, 1938.

"*Maria hominum Corredemptrix,* IL c. 4.

"*De *alma Socia Christi Mediatoris, sect.* I, c. 5.

" *Jucunda semper,* September 8, 1894.

'"Ad diem *ilium,* February 2, 1904.

▮" Apostolic Letter, March 22, 1918.

De *laudibus S Matris Christi Mariae.*

'"Serm. 1, De B. Virgine.

'"Cf. *Mariale,* q. 51.

'"De *sept, verbis Domini, tr.* 3.

1,1 Cf. Bcllarmine, De *controv. Christ, fidei,* V, c. 3.

'"Summ., IV, 15, c. 41.

'"*Super Magnificat,* tr. 2.

"* Cf. Godts, La *Corrédemptrice, II, c.* 5.

Cf. Schccbcn, *Handbuch der Kath. Dogmatik,* n. 1793.

'"Cf. Bartmann, *Précis de Théol. Dogm.,* Ill, sect. 2, c. 3. app.

'"*In laud. Deip.,* horn. 5.

Cf. *In Nativit.,* horn. 2.

'- Cf. Summ., IV, 5, c. 2.

'" Cf. St. Albert the Great, *Mariale, d.* 42.

'" Cf. St. Antoninus, Summ., IV, 15, c. 10; Gerson, *op. cit.,* tr. II.

'"Cf. Gerson, *loc. cit.*

'" *Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 4, a. 3, ad rum.

'"Le *Sacerdoce et le Sacrifice de* N.S. *Jésus-Christ.*

'"Cf. Perrone, De *Incarnatione,* II, c. 6, p. 627.

Cf. Bover, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* an. IV, fasc. Il; *Cregorianum,* VI, fasc. I.

'" Cf. Or. in S. *Mariam Deiparam, Hom. Mariales Byzantines.*

'" *Or. 6 in Deip. Virginis ingressum.*

'" *Or.* 7 in *eamdem solemnitatem.*

'"Cf. St. John Damascene, Or. 1 de *Assumptione;* St. Bonaventure, *De donis Sp. Sancti,* coll. 5, 14.

m Summa theol., Illa, q. 48, a. 4.

'"Ep. *ad Episc. Calaritanum,* January 9, 1801.

'"*Mariale,* XXX, q. 51.

"* Cf. *Expos, in Pass. Domini.*

'"Cf. In *111am,* d. 28, a. 2, q. 2, ad ult.

▮" Cf. *loc. cit.*

Cf. *Mariale,* q. 78; qq. 148-50.

▮"Cf. *Jucunda semper,* September 8, 1894.

CHAPTER THREE

'*Lib. contra articulos falso imporrtas S. Augustino.*

•Cf. *Mariale,* q. 90.

•Cf. *Theol.* Dogm . XIV, c. 9.

'Ad *diem ilium,* February 2, 1904.

•Cf. Piazza, *Christianorum* in *sanctos sanctorumque Reginam . . . devotio vindicata.*

'Cf. *op. cit.,* III, q. 2, a. 5, n. 198.

'Cf. St. Petet Canisius, De *Maria Virg. incomp.,* V, cc. 8-9.

'Cf. *Diptycha Mariana,* II, punct. 10.

'Cf. *op. cit.*

"Cf. De *culto publico ab Ecclesia* B. *Mariae exhibito,* d. 2, sect. 1, c. 1.

''Cf. *1st Maria die Mittlerin aller Gnaden:* cf. Clement, *"S. Alphonse de Liguori," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* January, 1931.

"Gloriosae Dominae. September 27, 1748.

"Ampliatio privilegiorum Ecclesiae BAf.V., 1806.

"Ubi primum, February 2, 1849.

"Supremi apostolatus, September i, 1883.

"Octobri mense, September 22, 1897.

"Jucunda semper, September 8, 1894.

"Adjutricem populi, September 5, 1895.

"Diuturni temporis, September 5. 1898.

"Ad diem illum. February 2, 1904.

"Inter sodalitia, March *22,* 1918.

■ *Galliam Ecclesiae filiam primogenitam,* March *2,* 1922; *Cognitum sane,* May 14. 1926.

''*Caritate Christi compulsi,* May 3, 1932.

"Solemne semper, August 15, 1932.

■Cf Toledo, *Comm, et Annot. in Epist. ad Romanos, c.* 4.

"Cf. Dillenschneider: *La Mariologie de S. Alphonse de Liguori. Sources et synthèse doctrinale,* c. n.

"Augustissimae V. *Mariae.* September 12, 1897.

"Cf. St. Irenaeus, Adv. *haereres,* III, 22; Tertullian, *De came Christi;* St. Ephrem, *Serm. exeg. ad Gen., c.* 3; St. Epiphanius, Adv. *haereses,* III, 78; St. John Chrysostom, *Hom.* in S. *Pascha;* St. Ambrose, *De Instit. Virgin., c. 14; St.* Augustine, Serm. 13, *De Natali Domini; De symbol, ad catech.,* c. 4.

"Cf. Bover, *"St. Ephraem Svri testimonia de BM.V. mediatione," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses.* IV, fasc. *2;* St. Epiphanius. *Or. de laud. S. Mariae Diparae;* St. John Chrysostom, *Or. in Nat. BM.V.;* St. Basil, *Or. in Annuntiationem;* St. Andrew, *Or. j de Virg. M. Nativit.*

"Cf. St. Epiphanius. *Advers. haer.* 78; St. Augustine, *De Sancta Virginii..* c. 6; St. Peter Chrysologus, Senn. 140, *De. Annunt.,* Serm. 64.

"Cf. St. Cyril of *Alexandria, Hom. 4, Contra Nestorium; St.* Modestus. *Encom. in B. Virginem; St.* Andrew, *Or. in Sanctiss. Dorn, nostrae Deiparae dormitionem.*

■ *Cone, in S. Mariae Zonam.*

■ *Oratio ad B. Virginem.*

"Serm. 3, *In Virg. Nativ. Domini;* cf. also Senn. 1 and 3, *In Assumpt. B. Mariae; Serm. in Nativ. Mariae.*

■Cf. *Mariale,* q. 29; *ibid., q.* 147, 148; *In Postillis super Luc,* c. 1, 10; cf. also Desmarais. S. *Albert le Grand. Docteur de la Médiation Mariale.*

"Cf. St. John Damascene, *Encom. in dormit. B. Mariae Virg.;* St. Theodorus, *Laudatio in dormitionem Deiparae;* Eadmer, *De excel!. Virg.,* e. 12; Hugh of St. Victor. *Miscellan., HI.*

tit. 4; St. Amadeus, De *laud.* B. Virg., horn. 2; Cardinal Hugo, *Postilla super Evang. sec. Luc., c.* 1; Richard of St. Lawrence, De *laudib. B. Mariae,* II; St. Bonaventure, Scrm. *2, In Nativ. Domini;* Conrad of Saxony, *Speculum B.M. Virg., lect.* 3; Raymond Jourdain, *Contempt, de B.M. Virgine, V,* con. 4; IX, con. 14; Bovcr, *"Univ. B. Mariae mediatio in scriptis Joannis Gerson," Gregorianum,* IX, fasc. *2,* 1928; St. Bernardine of Siena, Scrm. 6, *In Annunt. B.M. Virg.;* Scrm. 52, De *salut, angelica;* Denis the Carthusian, De *vita et fine solitarii,* II, a. 7.

"De Maria Virgine incomparabili et Dei Genitrice, I, c. 2.

" Cf. *ibid.,* I, c. 8.

‘‘Cf. St. Robert, Cone. 42, De *Nativ.* B.M.V.; St. Lawrence, *Mariale.*

*°St. John Eudes, Cœur *admirable,* II, c. 4, sect. 2.

‘‘ Cf. Glories of *Mary,* I, c. 5.

‘‘Cf. *True Devotion,* II, c. 4, sect.

‘‘ Cf. Bossuet, *Oeuvres,* VII, p. 778; St. Francis de Sales, *Scrm. pour la Visitation;* Leonard of Port Maurice, *Acta O. Fr. Min.,* May 1, 1938; Salmerôn, Comm, *in Evang. Hist.,* II, lib. III, tr. 5; Suércz, *In Illam,* d. 18, sect. 3, a. 4; Salazar, In *Prov.,* c. 8; Vega, *op. cit.,* pol. 29, cert. 4; Blessed John of Avila, *Obras espirituales;* Blessed Alphonsus of Orozco, *Trat. de las doce estrelias;* Venerable John Palaphox, *Pastor, y abeced. espiritual;* Nieremberg, *Tratado de la aficibn y amor a Maria.* Cf. also the writings of Scgneri, Novato, D'Argentan, Reichenbergcr, Crossct, Bona, De Cerf, Boudon, Ketwigh, Arias, José de Jesus Maria and José Valdivielso.

‘‘ Cf. Summa *theol.,* la, q. 22, a. 3; Ila Ilae, q. 83, a. 11.

‘‘Cf. Marie, *Médiatrice de toutes les grâces.*

‘‘Cf. Comp, *theol., c.* 241.

" Cf. Scrm. 2, *De Pentecost.*

“Summa theol., la Ilae, q. 106, a. 3. Cf. also Lagrange, *L'Evangile selon Saint Jean.*

‘‘Cf. Cornelius a Lapide, Comm. *in Epist. ad Romanos,* c. 4.

‘‘Cf. Guevara, In *cap. 1 Matth.,* obs. 15.

‘‘ Cf. Broise, Marie, *Mère de grâce.*

“Cf. Lepicicr, op. *cit.,* Ill, c. 1, a. 4.

‘‘ Cf. op. cit., V, c. 1.

‘‘ Magnae Dei *Matris,* September 8, .892.

‘‘ Cf. Encom. 2, *Dormit. Deiparae,* c. 8.

‘‘Hom. 8, De *Mariae Virg. plen. sive perfect, gloria et erga suos clientes patrocinio.*

"Cf. Contenson, *Theol. mentis et cordis,* I, lib. I, d. 5, c. 2.

‘‘Cf. In Ps. 36, expos. 3.

“Summa theol., Illa, q. 8, a. 3.

" Cf. Gotti, *Theol. Schol. Dogm., De Deo Incarnato,* tr. III, q. 3, dub. 3.

‘‘Senn. 61, *Super admir. gratia et gloria B.M. Virginis; cf.* similar statements in St. Ephrem (quoted by Bovcr, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* IV, April, 1927) and St. Antoninus, Summ., tit. 13, c. 14.

‘‘Or. *de Cruce;* cf. II, c. 1, q. 2.

" Cf. *Serm. in fer. IV Uebd. Sanctae.*

“Summa theol., Illa, q. 59, a. 6.

‘‘Cf. *De Veritate,* q. 29, a. 7, ad 5. Cf. also Pctau, De *Incam.,* XII, c.

‘‘The moral cause is distinguished from the final cause, although there is a certain similarity between the two. The final cause attracts the efficient cause by its goodness, while the moral cause docs not act in this way, because the petitions, the mandate, the merits, the example, are not the end which is sought by the operation, though the good of the end can also be mixed with the motives or moral reasons

which arc suggested by him who gives counsel or petitions in order to move the agent.

"Cf. Valencia. *Comm. Theol.,* II. d, 7, q· 4> punCt. 2.

"Cf. Denz. 799.

•Gonet, De *Sacramentis in genere,* d. *3. a.* 4.

"Cf. Denz., *loc. cit.*

''Cf. *Mariale,* q. 42; cf. also *ibid.,* q. 29.

''Cf. De *praecon. et dign. Mariae,* II, a. 9.

"Cf. *Theol. Schol.,* tr. 8, d. *unie.,* q. 5, sect. *3.*

"Cf. In *III, d.* 3, sect. 5.

"Cf. *Mariale,* q. 42.

"Cf. De *natura et gratia,* II, c. 9.

'' Cf. Bittrcmieux, De *mediatione universali B.M. Virginis quoad gratias,* II, c. 7, a. 3; Merkelbach, *Mariologia,* III, q. 2, a. 4.

"Cf. Gonet, *Clypeus Theol. Thomist.,* V, d. 3, a. 4.

"Cf. Héris, *Revue de Sciences Phil, et Théol.,* an. VI, n. 4, October, 1927; Friethoff, De *alma Soda Christi Mediatoris,* sect. 2, c. 7.

"Cf. *Tr. de Beatiss. Virg.,* HI, c. 1,

" Cf. *Cienda Tomista,* XX, n. 102, Sept.-Oct., 1928.

" Cf. Hugon, *La causalité instrumentale en théologie;* Lavaud, *"De la causalité instrumentale de Marie," Rev. Thorn.,* X, 1927; Bernard, *La maternité de grâce; The Mystery of Mary,* chap. P·

''Cf. Mura, *Le Corps mystique du Christ,* II, c. 9; Jacono, *Maria Sentissima mediatrice di tutte la grazie,* p. 202.

''Cf. Suârez, *In III,* d. 23, sect. 1.

" Cf. *Gregorianum,* Vol. *VIII,* fasc. 1, March, 1927.

« Cf. Diekamp, *Theol. Dogm. Manuale, II, sect.* 4; *Mariol., c. 2;* Cuervo, *La Cienda Tomista, LVI,* fascs. i-a, «937·

"Jucunda semper. September 8, 1894.

''Cf. SuArez, In *III,* disp. *23,* sect.

* Cf. De *Myst. Incarnat.,* d. *2, c. 2,* spec. 2.

" *Summa theol.,* la, q. 106, a. *3;* cf. also Satolli, De *operat, div.,* d. 8, lect. 6.

" Cf. St. Thomas, De *verit.,* q. 27, a. 5.

" *Cf.* John of St. Thomas, De sacramentis in genere, d. 22, q. 62, a. 2.

"Summa theol., Illa, q. 64, a. 7.

" *Epist. contra Paulum Samosatenum.*

''Cf. Lepicier, Tr. de Beat. Virgine, III.c. 1, a. 2.

"Cf. John of St. Thomas, Curs. *theol., De Sacram.,* q. 62, d. 25, a. 1.

"Cf. Rohellec, *Marie, dispensatrice des grâces divines,* II, 2.

" Cf. *Epist. ad Emmum. Card. Carretti, July* 14, 1928.

" Cf. De *corpora et sanguine Domini.*

'"*Cf.* M. de la Taille, *Mysterium fidei,* elticid. 50, app. 1.

Cf. Suarez, In *III,* d. 1. sect. 1.

''Cf. Benedict XIV, *De Serv. Dei beatif. et beat, canoni.,* IV, p. 2, c. 31; Vega, *op. cit.,* pa). 21, cert. 2; Basabe, *Maria y la Eucaristia,* I, c. 2.

" *Cf.* Denz. 355.

,M Ep. ad Rom.

Lib. de mysteriis, c. 9.

■" Cf. *Comm, in Ps.* 98.

Cf. St. Martin, Scrm. 2, *In Nativ. S. Mariae;* St. John Damascene, De *Fide orth.,* IV, c. 13.

Scrm. 3, *De Nativ. Virg.*

'"*Cf.* Aratijo, *In Illam D. Thom.,* q. 76, a. ;, dub. unie.

"*Cf. Guevara, *In cap.* 1 *Matt.,* observ. 15, sect. 3.

"* Cf. Senn. 2, De *Natali Domini.*

■''Cf. *De gloria et hon. Filii horni-*

Cf. *De laud. B. Mariae,* I.

‘‘· Cf. Terrien, *La Mire des hommes,* VIII, c. 2.

‘‘Cf. Lcpicier, op. *cit.,* Ill, c. i, a. 2.

‘‘Cf. *Catech.,* XXII.

‘‘Cf. St. Augustine, Senn. 41, De *Tempore.*

‘‘Cf. *Hom. in Epiph. Domini.*

‘•Cf. *ibid.*

’"Cf. St. Irenaeus, Adv. *Haeres.,* Ill, c. >8.

‘‘ Cf. Lcpicier, De Ss. *Euchar. sacr.,* 1, q. 1, a. 6.

‘‘Cf. Novato, De *Emin. Deiparae,* I, c. 8, q.40.

‘‘ Cf. Salazar, *In Prov., c.* 9.

‘‘*Cf. Bini, *Cone. generalia et provincialia,* III. St. Jerome says that Jesus eats and is eaten *(Ep.* 150, Ad *Hevidiam).*

‘‘ *Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 81, a. 1.

‘‘This is the teaching of George of Nicomedia.

m Cf. *op. cit.,* I, c. 9.

‘‘Cf. *op. cit.,* V, c. 1.

‘‘ Cf. St. Peter Canisius, *op. cit.,* IV,

‘‘Cf. De *Paschae observatione,* tr. 2.

1,1 Cf. Summo *theol.,* Ia, q. ia, a. 6.

‘‘Cf. St. Peter Chrysologus, Serm. 148, De *Incarn. sacrament;* Thomassin, De Incarn. Verbi Dei, II, c. 3.

‘‘Cf. *Dial.,* IV, c. 55.

‘‘ Serm. 4, *In Salve Regina.*

‘‘Cf. The Blessed *Sacrament, sec.* 6.

‘‘Cf. *L'Eucaristia e la Vergine, studio e commento sulla rivelazione della B. Martinengo,* II, a. 3.

‘‘ Cf. Maria y *la Eucaristia,* II, c. 3.

‘‘ *Ilustraciôn del Clero: "La Santisima Virgen, Sagrario viviente,* 1935-36.

‘‘Cf. Paquet, De *Novissimis, d.9,* q. 2, a. 3; Barbéns, La *vida en el cielo,* I, c. 22.

‘‘Cf. Godinez, *Praxis Theol. Mysticae,* II, q. 3, s. 7, n. 399.

‘‘ Cf. Lcpicier, De *stabilitate et progressu dogmatis,* II, a. 9, η. z6.

Cf. De *Christi Ecclesia,* II, sect 2, η. 218.

Cf. Dcnz. 430; 940.

‘‘Cf. Denz. 938.

Cf. William of Paris, De *Sacr. Euch.,* c. 2; St. Peter Damian, Liber *qui appellatur Dominus vobiscum,* c. 8.

‘‘ Cf. Remigius of Auxerre, De *div. ofpe.*

Secret of the Mass, Ninth Sunday after Pentecost.

‘‘Cf. Biel, Can. *Missae Exposit.,* lect. 26.

‘‘ Cf. *Myster. Fidei,* elucid. 26.

‘‘Cf. Secret of the Mass, *Feria IV post Pascha.*

151 Cf. *Tract, de praepar. ad Missam, c.* 1; Cf. also Gihr, The *Sacrifice of the Mass,* I, c. 3, a. 3.

‘‘ Cf. Billuart, De *almo Euchr. Sacrament.,* d. 8, a. 3.

Summa theol., Ill a, q. 79, a. 7, ad aum.

‘‘Cf. De Ss. *Euch. Sacram, et Sacrif.,* II, th. 13.

‘‘ *Secret of the Mass of Our Lady of Mount Carmel.* Cf. also Garénaux, *Marie, Reine du Clergé,* Congrès Mariale de Boulougne-sur-Mer, 1938.

‘‘Cf. Denz. 1281.

‘‘Cf. *Arcanum,* February 10, 1890.

‘‘ Cf. De Guibert, De *Christi Ecclesia,* the. 18, η. 164.

‘‘ Serm. 267; Hurter, De *Eccl. Christi,* tr. 3, a. 2. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia,* sect. 1, c. 2.

‘‘Cf. Dieckmann, De *Ecclesia,* t. 1, tr. 2, c. 1.

‘‘Cf. De *laud. glor. Virg. Mariae,* IV, a. 16.

‘‘Vie de *la Bienhereuse Vierge Marie,* III, c. 2.

‘‘Cf. *Paedag.,* 1.

‘‘Hom. 85, alias 84, In *Joannem.*

‘‘ *In /oannem,* tr. 120.

‘‘ Serm. 68.

‘‘ Lib. de ligno *vitae.*

‘‘ *Cf.* St. Gregory the Great, *Moral.,* 28.

'•Cf. *Mariale.* q. 29.
1» Cf. Sumrn., IV, tit. 15, c. 2.
m Cf. *Quamquam pluries,* August 15, 1889.
›'' Cf. Suârez, In III. ‹l. 49. sect. 1.
‘‘Cf. Vcn. Bcdc, *Carmen de Ascensione Domini;* St. John Damascene, In *Analepsim* D.N.J. *Christi;* Ogara, "De *Ascensionis Christi spectatoribus," Gregorianum,* Vol. XIV, fasc. 1, 1933.
"· *Jucunda semper,* September 8, 1894.
"‘‘Cf. *Catech.,* 17
"· *Jucunda semper,* September 8, 1894.
"*Adjutricem populi,* September 5, 1895.
”* Or. 8, *Stabant juxta crucem.*
Horn. 7, De *laud, B. Virg.*
De *triumphali Christi agone,* c. 18.
‘‘‘‘ Cf. St. Peter Canisius, *op. cit.,* V,
‘‘* Cf. Broisse, *La Sainte Vierge,*
"° *De Instit. Virg., c.* 7.
‘‘‘‘Horn 4 *super "Missus est."*
‘‘‘‘ Cf. Eadmer, De *excell. Virg.,* c. 7.
1MCf. Knabenbauer, *Comm, in Evang. see. Lucam, prolegom.;* cf. also Petitalot, *La Vierge, Mère d'après la Théologie,* c. 22; Christiani, *Marie et les Evangiles,* c. 4.
Cf. Telch, *Introd. generalis in Scrip, sacram,* q. 3, a. 3.
'"Cf. Franzclin, *De Ecclesiae Traditione,* th. 5.
'"Cf. *Il Cuore della Madré di Amore,* c. 4.
"Cf. Summe *theol.,* Ia Hae, q. 14,
Decree of April 22,1903.
'"Cf. De *Instit. Virg.,* II.
'"Cf. Guevara, In *cap.* 1 *Matth.,* observ. 10.
'" Cf. Dieckman, De *Ecclesia,* tr. 2, c.4.q·».
Adjutricem populi, September 5, .«95-
'"Hom. contra *Nestorium.*
'"Cf.In *Apoc.,* c. 12.
'"Cf. *A.A.S.,* XXIX, n. 13.
'"Cf. *ibid.*
m Cf. Contra Nestorium.
” Or. in Deip. Pressent.
‘‘Ex *hymn. Graecorum, Akathistos.*
‘‘Common of the Blessed Virgin; Office of the Blessed Virgin.
‘‘ Cf. Mersch, *"Sainte Marie, Mère de Dieu," Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* February, 1940; Hurter, tr. 7, *Mariologia, sch. practicum.*
‘‘ *Fidentem piumque,* September 20, 1896.
‘‘ *Adjutricem populi,* September 5, 1895.
‘‘ *Ecclesiam Dei,* November 12, 1923.
Mortalium animos. January *6,* 1928.
‘‘Lux *veritatis,* December 25, 1931.
‘‘ *Or. in dorm. B.M. Virg.*
"De cath. Eccl. unitate.
"See St. Antoninus, *Summa,* p. Ill, tit. 15, c. 15; Richard of St. Lawrence, *De laud. BM. Virginis,* IX.
‘‘Lux *veritatis,* December 25, 1931.

CHAPTER FOUR

1 Cf. St. Thomas, *In III Sent.,* 19, q. i,a. 5.
‘*Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 20, a. *2;* cf. also St. Bonaventure, *In III Sent., d.* 19, a. *2, q. 2.*
‘*Cf.* Wirceburgenses, *De Incarn., diss. V, sec. 1,* a. *2.*
‘*Senn, q-j,* c. 12, n. 21.
‘Cf. *Adv. haer., HI, c.* 18.
*Cf. Satolli, *De Incarn.,* II, q, *26; see also* Petavius, *De Incarn., XII,* c. 3; Cajctan, *In Hlam.* q. j6, a. a.
'Cf. Friethoff, *De alma soda Christi Mediatoris.* sect. 1. c. i; Merkelbach.

Mariologia, III, a. 2. n. 179, *nota.*

■Cf. Jcanjacquot, *Simples explications sur la coopération de la très Sainte Vierge a l'oeuvre de la rédemption,* c. 1.

•Cf. Clement, *"S. Alphonse de Liguori et la médiation de Marie," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* January, 1931.

Ineffabilis, December 8, 1854.

"Adjutricem populi, September 5, «895.

" Miserentissimus Redemptor, May 8, 1928.

" Cf. *Caritate Christi compulsi,* May 3. '9Î2.

"Cf. St. Ephrcm, Or. *ad Dei Genitr.,* III, 575, 576; St. Epiphanius (or whoever is the author) Or. *de laud. S. Mariae Deiparae;* St. John Chrysostom, Or. *in Nativ. B. Virg.;* Basil de Selcucia, Or. in Annunt.; St. Andrew of Crete, Or. 4, In *Nativ. Dei Genitricis;* St. Germanus of Constantinople, Laud, in Dormit., Or. 3; St. John Damascene, Or. 1, *In Dormit.;* St. Theodore, Laud, in Dormit. *Deiparae;* St. Antoninus, Summ., Ill, tit. 31, c. 2; Denis the Carthusian, De *vita et fine solitarii,* II, a. 7. Cf. also Bovcr, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* an. VI, fasc. 3, July, 1929.

'* Cf. Bovcr, *loc. cit.*

" Cf. In *Menaeis.*

"Summa theol., Illa, q. 26, a. 1; cf. Estius, In *Hl Sent.,* d. >9, n. 6.

"Cf. *Enarrat. in Ps.,* 95.

" Cf. Muratori, *Della regol. divo-*

"See Pohle-Prcuss, *Mariology,* p. 122: "Even the title *co-redemptrix* had better be avoided as misleading. The titles *redemptrix* and *co-redemptrix* were never applied to the Blessed Virgin before the sixteenth century; they are the invention of comparatively recent writers (Castclplanio, Faber, Minges and others)." Cf. also La Broisse-Bainwel, Marie, *Mère de grâce* (Introd.); Rivière, *"Sur la notion de Maria Mediatrice," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* an. II, fasc. 2, April, 1925.

" Cf. Schcebcn, *Mariology,* Vol. II, p. 199, note: "Numerous theological expressions become refined by controversy and their soundness or unsoundness eventually becomes established and accepted. Development of doctrine did not come to an end with the Church Fathers. The same may be said with regard to the exact meaning of certain titles applied to the Blessed Virgin." Schceben questioned the fitness of the title *co-redemptrix.* But since his day, the title has been sanctioned by the highest ecclesiastical authorities, and its orthodoxy is therefore beyond doubt. (Translator's note.)

"Cf. Bartmann, *Précis de Thiol. Dogmatique,* I, III, app.; Schütz, *Mediatrix.*

"Cf. *L'Osservatore Romano,* n. 101, April 29, 1935.

" Decree of May 18, 1908.

"Cf. St. Ephrem, cited by Bover, *op. cit.;* Ballcrini, *Sylloge.,* II.

" Cf. Or. 2, *In Dormit. B.V. Mariae.*

"Cf. St. John Damascene, *Serm. in Annunt.* B.V. *Mariae;* Alenin, Hom. 3.

" Cf. Theol. *Schol.,* tr. 8, d. un., q. 5, sect. 3.

" Cf. George of Nicomedia, Or. in Ss. *Deip. ingressum;* St. Albert the Great, *Mariale,* q. 29; St. Peter Damian, Hom. 45, *Opera omnia.*

" Cf. St. Bernard, Epist. 174, Ad *Can. Lugdun.;* Peter Blesense, *Serm. in Nativ. B. Mariae;* Denis the Carthusian, De *prec. et dign. Mariae,* II, a. 9.

" Cf. Bover, "B.V. Maria, *hominum Corredemptrix," Gregorianum,* Vol. VI, fasc. 4, December, 1925.

" Cf. *Theol. Mariana,* pal. 30, cert. 4-

" Cf. Salmerôn, Comm, *in Evang. Historiam,* X, tr. 41.

" Cf. *Panoplia Mariana.*

■Cf. Schütz, Summ. Mtfriena, I, p. 5'4

"Cf. De *decretis Syn. Nicaenae.*

"Cf. Carol, *"Episcopatus catholicus et B. Virginis Corredemptio," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* an. XVI, fasc. 4, 1939; *L'Osservatore Romano,* May 19-20, 1924; Card. *Lepicicr, L'imrnaculata Madré di Dio, Corredentrice dei genere umano; Tr. de B.V. Maria, Matre Dei,* III, c. 1. a. 3.

"Cf. *The Young Priest,* p. 47.

" Cf. Card. Mercier, *Lettre pastorale,* November 1, 1924.

"Cf. Dieu *Père des miséricordes, Lettre pastorale,* February 11, 1938.

"Cf. Bover, *"Maria, hominum corredemptrix," Gregorianum,* Vol. IV, fasc. 4, December, 1925.

" *Enarr. in Ps.* 29, 2.

"Cf. *Comm. Theol.,* IV, d. 1, q. 22, punct. 3.

" *Mariale,* q. 148.

" Cf. Dublanchy, *"Marie Médiatrice," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,* IX.

"Cf. Bittremicux, De *Mediatione universali B.M.* Virg. *quoad gratias,* I, c. 4, a. 3; Merkelbach, *Mariologia,* III, a. *2;* Keuppens, *Mariologiae Compendium,* II, sect. 1, c. 1-2; Zubizarreta, *Medulla Theologiae Dogmaticae.*

"Cf. Tr. de Beatissima Virgine, III, a. 1,8.3.

"Cf. *Mysterium Fidei,* elucid. 50, epilogue.

" See *Mary's Part in our Redemption,* chap. 9.

" Cf. In *Joann.,* tr. 84.

" Cf. Serm. 12, *De Pass. Domini.*

*· Cf. Estius, In *III Sent.,* d. 19, s. 6.

" Or. 47, quoted by Pope Leo XIII, *Adjutricem populi,* September 5, 1895.

" Cf. *"Les mystères de la Ste. Trinité et de la grâce." Revue Ecclésiastique de Liège,* an. XXVII, n. 3, November, 1935.

" Cf. *Ampliatio privilegionim Ecclesiae* B.M. Virginis *ab angelo salutatae in coenobio FF. Ord. Serv.* B M. Virginis *Florentinae, an. 1806.*

" Cf. Proesentissimum, March 30, 1830.

"Cf. *Praesentissimum,* May 18, 1832.

"Quamquam pluries, August 15, 1889.

■ *Ad diem ilium,* February 2, 1904.

"Lux *veritatis,* December 25, 1931.

" Cf. *Explorata res est,* February 2, 1923.

" *Summa theol.,* la, q. 1, a. 10.

■ Cellini, *Propaedeutica Biblica,* III.

·* See Scheeben, *op. cit.*. Vol. II, pp 246-47: 'This idea relative to Mary's motherhood certainly appears in tradition of fairly recent date. As to the traditional character of this idea in general, . . . it finds its Scriptural motivation in all that is advanced for Mary's cooperation in the redemption. . . . The vision of the beloved disciple of our Lord provides a positive and exegetical reason for applying to Mary's spiritual motherhood over all the redeemed, in a more sublime yet general sense, the words of the Savior: 'Woman, behold thy son. Son, behold thy Mother.' Literally, they do not exclusively contain a recommendation of the Mother to the loving care of the son, or an admonition to that son to honor the Mother; but they do undoubtedly hold a recommendation of the son to the loving care of the Mother, which in a higher, more universal sense refers to Mary's spiritual motherhood of the redeemed." (Translator's note.)

"Cf. Suàrez, *In III,* d. 37; Knabenbauer. *Comm, in Joann.;* Murillo, *San Juan, estudio critico y exegitico;* Corluy, *Comm, in Evang. Joannis;* Fillion, *La Sainte Bible, Evang, selon S. Jean;* Lagrange, *Evang, selon S. Jean.*

"Adjutricem populi. September *5,*

1895. Cf. also Toledo, *In sacros Joan. Evang.,* c. 19; Contenson, De *Mysterio Incarnationis.* X, d. 6, c. 2.

"Cf. Przybylski, *De Marialogia S. Irenaei Lugdunensis.*

‘‘Cf. St. Epiphanius, Haer. 78; St. Ambrose, De *Instit. Virg., c.* 14 and 15; St. Augustine, De *Virginit., c.* 6; St. Peter Chrysologus, Serm. 40; St. Anselm. Or. 7, Ad *Sand. Virg. Mariam;* St. Albert the Great, *Mariale,* q. 29; St. Bonaventure, *In Soliloquiis;* Conrad of Saxony, *Speculum B.V.M.,* lect. 10.

"Cf. Aubron, *"La Mariologie de Saint Bernard," Recherche de Science Religieuse,* XXIV, n. 5, 1934; Nogués, *Mariologie de Saint Bernard,* c. 4.

"Bainvel, *Marie, Mère de Crdcc,* IV.

"Sinibaldi, Il *cuore della Madrc di Amore,* c. 1.

" *"Doctrina Mariana Leonis XIII," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* IV, fasc. 31,1927.

"Cf. Novatus, De *Eminentia Deiparae Virginis,* I, c. 8, q. 25.

''*Ad diem ilium,* February 2, 1904.

''Lux *veritatis,* December 25, 1931.

'•Cant. 7:2.

" Cf. St. Ambrose, De *Instil. Virg.,* cc. 14-15; Salmcrôn, Comm, in Evang. *Historiam,* IV, p. 7; II, tr. 9; Orosius, Cone, *de Virg. Rosario.*

'' De *Virginitate, c.* 6.

''' De *natura boni.*

"Trad, de B.V.M., serm. 6.

“Quamquam pluries. August 15, 1889.

"Quod *nupcr,* January 6, 1933.

‘‘St. Albert the Great, *Mariale,* q. 29; cf. also Rupert of Deutz, In *Joann.,*

61 St. Antoninus, *Summa, P. IV,* tit. 15, C.2.

‘‘St. Alphonsus, Glories of Mary, Salve Regina, c. 1.

‘‘Cf. De Vita in *Christo,* I.

" Cf. Tr. de *Incam.,* I, sect. 2, m. 3, c. 2, q. 8.

‘‘Cf. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia,* c. 4.

"Octobri mense, September 22, 1891.

"Magnae Dei Matris, September 8, 1892.

" Octobri mense, September 22, .891.

"Cf. *In Luc.* 9:27.

‘‘Cf. John of St. Thomas, De Ineam., d. 10, q. 8, a. 2; Debout, La *femme aux douze étoiles,* p. 132.

•‘Cf. Bona, *Defensio B.V. Mariae . . . contra libellum intitulatum Monita salutaria . . .* , c. 9.

"Cf. Pope Boniface IX, *Instit. Pestivit. Visitationis B.M. Virginis,* 1390; Pope Pius VII, *Indultum recolendae in protedricem principalem B.M. Virginis sub titulo de Gratia in oppido Carmonensi, dioec. Hispal.,* 1805; Pope Pius XI, *Miserentissirnus Redemptor,* May 8, 1928.

" Comm, in *Joan.*

"Cf. St. Irenaeus, *Haer., V,* c. 49; Bover, *"S. Ephraem Syri testim. de B.M.V. mediatione," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* IV, fasc. *2,* 1927.

‘‘ Hom., In *Zonam.*

"Cf. St. Bernard, Serm. *1, De Assumpt. B. Virginis.*

Cf. St. Bonaventure, *Memorialium,* epist. 25.

‘‘‘‘De *contemplatione B.V.,* prol.

,ra *Salve Regina.*

Cf. Denz. 342.

lw Cf. Denz. 984.

'‘‘Cf. *Roman Catechism,* VI, c. 5.

Cf. Cum *praeexcelsa,* February 28, 1476; Denz. 734.

Cf. loc. cit.

Cf. *Jucunda semper,* September 8, 1894.

,M Cf. Bover, *op. cit.*

"‘Cf. Laudatio in Dormit. B.V.

*‘‘ Cf. *Serm. de Nativit. Virginis;* cf. also St. Anselm, Or. *ad.* 3, Virg.

Mariam in Assumpt. ejus; Godofrcdus, In omni *festivit. B. Mariae.*

"* Cf. St. Gregory the Great, *Moral,* XXII, c. 17. St. Thomas says the same thing when he remarks that Jesus presents Himself to the Father in His human nature and thus intercedes for us (in *III Sent.,* d. 57, 6).

Cf. St. Gregory Nazianzcn, *Or.* 36.

Cf. Bover, *op. cit.;* Arnold of Chartres, *De laud. Mariae;* Berlcndo, *Elogia glorioriss. Virg. Deip. Mariae ad Lit. Lauretanas.*

"* Cf. De *Incarnat. Verbi.*

"'*Deprec. ad glorioss. Virginem;* cf. also St. Ephrem, Ag., Ill, 515; St. Anselm, Or. 7, *Ad S. Virg. Mariam.*

Cf. St. Thomas, *Contra Gentes,* III, c. 96; cf. also Vega, *op. cit.,* pal. 30, cert. 1.

"•*Op. cit.*

"'*Augustissimae Virginis,* September 12, 1897.

"Cf. Bover, *op. cit.*

"Cf. Ep. 29, *Ad Stephanum monachum.*

"Cf. Or. 1, *Ad S. Virg. Mariam.*

"Cf. In *Cant.,* II, c. 23.

"Cf. De *Laud. B. Mariae,* III.

"Cf. St. Antoninus, *Summ., IV,* tit. 5> c. 17.

"* *Summa Theol.,* Ila llae, q. 83,

" Cf. Sudrez, In III, disp. 23, sect. 2.

*" Cf. Sudrez, In III, d. 22, sect. 2.

"Cf. *Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 13, a. 2.

Cf. Widcnfeldt, *op. cit.*

"* *Ineffabilis Deus,* December 8, >854.

"· *Octobri mense,* September 22, .891.

"· *Supremi apostolatus,* September 1, 1883. Pope Pius XI wrote in a similar way; cf. *Auspicatus ad Emmurn. Card. Binet,* January 28, 2933.

*** *Ad dicm ilium,* February 2, 1904.

"Cf. St. Ephrem, *Ag., Ill,* 536-39; St. John Damascene, *Serm. in Annunt.; St.* Euthymius, *Laud in concept. S. Annae,* George of Nicomedia, Or. 6, *In Ss. Dei* Gent, *ingressum;* St. Peter Damian, Serm. 1, De *Nativ. Mariae;* St. Anselm, Or. 4. Ad B.V. *Mariam;* Eadmer, De *excell. Virginis,* c, ta; Adam of Persenia, *Mariale seu laudes* Ss. *Deip. Virg., serm.* 1 in Annunt ; Raymond Jourdain, *Contempt, de B.M. Virgine,* cont. 12.

'" Semi. 2, *In Dormit. Virg. Mariae.*

"*Serm.* in omni *fatnit.* BJVf. *Matris Domini.*

""Cf. St. Augustine, *In Ps.* 83, *ad*

""Cf. Theophilus of Alexandria, De *Incarnat. Verbi.*

'""Cf. Bossuet, Senn. 3. *Sur la Nativ.*

'" Cf. Carau, *Deip. elucid., triumph.,*

lU Summa theol., Illa, q. 18, a. 2.

'""Cf. St. Thomas, *op. cit.,* q. 18, a· ».

'""Cf. Eadmer, *Tract, de Concept. BM. Virginis.*

*'" Paciucch, *Super Salve Reg., exc.* 1; cf. also Denis the Carthusian, *De praec. et dign. Mariae,* III, a. 9; St. Ephrem, Ag., HI, 526-27, 532; St. Gennanus, Hom. in *Zonam.*

'""Serm. 17, *De Verbo Apost. c.* 1.

'"Cf. TrombeUi, De *cultu publico ab Ecclesiae B. Mariae exhibito,* d. 2, C. 7, sect. 2, q. 2; Neubert, *Marie dans le Dogme,* c. 2, 6.

Cf. *De cura pro mortuis gerenda,* c.4.

Rituale Romanum, tit. 5, c. 3.

"° Last prayer after the litany of the saints.

,aCf. *Denis* the Carthusian, *In IV Sent.,* d. 45, q. 4.

" *Roman Missal.*

"*Cf. Scapulare Marianum illustratum et defensum,* II, q. 4.

04 Cf. *De Poenitentia,* d. 48, sect. 5.

Cf. *In III Sent.,* dist. 45, q. j.

'""Cf. *In III Sent.,* d. 45, q. >; $ee also Diego Nufio, *In Addit.,* ad 3 part, q. 25, diff. 2.

Loc. cit.

'" *Cf.* Terrien, La *Mère des homines,* X, c. 2; Chrysostomc, "Les *trois grandes privilèges de Marie"; Muscat, "De virtute satisfactoria operum bonorum in ordine ad alios," D. Th. Plac.,* XL, *937-

"*Cf. Eliam a S. Tcrcsia, *Legatio Ecclesiae triumphantis ad militantem pro liberandis animabus purgatorii;* Arriaga, *Disput. theologicae,* V, *De caritate.*

'"Serai. 4, De *Assumpt. Virginis;* cf. also St. Germanus, *Hom. in Zonam;* St. Amadeus, Hom. 8, De *laud.*

Cf. *Benedictus Deus,* January 29, 1336; Dcnz. 530.

"' Cf. *Panoplia Mariana.*

'"Cf. *Summa theol., Suppi.,* q. 71, a. 5, ad ;um.

'"Cf. Bartmann, *Précis de Théol. Dogm.,* II, Lib. VI; *L'Eschatologie,* c. 1, n. 213.

'- Cf. Budge, *One Hundred and Ten Miracles of Our Lady Mary,* p. 172; John de Scalis, *De recreatione hominis;* Wilmart, *"Une méditation théologique sur les bienfaits de l'ordre surnaturel." Revue de Sciences Phil, et Théol.,* XV, n. 3, 1926.

'" Cf. Richard, *"Enfer," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique;* Pope Urban VIII, *Magnum Bullarium Romanum,* XIII, August 6, 1623; Terrien, *La Mère des hommes, X, c. 4.*

'"Cf. Or. 1, Ad *Sanctam Virg. M.*

'"Cf. Trombclli, *op. cit.,* d. 1, q. 4, c. 6; Terrien, loc. cit.

'" Cf. Estius, *In IV Sent.,* d. 46, n. 2.

"' Cf. Mendoza, *Viridarium sacrae et profanae eruditionis,* II, prob. 5; Garau, *Deipara elucidato,* II, 4; Crasset, *La véritable dévotion envers la S. Vierge, I,* tr. 1, q. 12.

Cf. St. Gregory the Great, *Moral.,* IX, c. 38; St. Hilary, Comm, *in Ps.,* 51; St. Bernard, Senn. 75, resp. ad lect. 7.

m Summa theol., la, q. 21, a. 4, ad rum.

'"Cf. Velâzquez, *Maria, advocata nostra,* I, adn. 16.

"'Cf. Lumbrcras, *Ciencia Tomista, XXVI,* nn. 151-52.

'"Cf. St. Augustine, De *Civitate Dei,* XXI, c. 2.

"'Cf. In IV *Sent.,* d. 45, q. 2, a. 2.

Cf. De *Theol. Dogmatibus: De Angelis,* III, c. 8.

Cf. Emery, Diss, sur *la mitigation des peines des damnés.;* Ventura, La *raison catholique et la raison philosophique,* III, conf. 21.

™*Del gran numero de los que se salvan y de la mitigaciôn de las penas eternas,* pp. 104, 131, 132, 133. This book was condemned by the Holy Office on February 19, 1936, and the author humbly submitted.

'•Cf. *Cathem. hymn.,* v. 125.

m Cf. Hugon, Tr. *de Novissimis,* q. 8, a. 2.

'"Cf. *Paraen* 1, Ad *Heliod. lapsum.*

Cf. *Lib. ad Demetr.*

Cf. *Enarr. in Ps.,* 105.

163 De *Anima,* c. 3.

""Cf. *De anima et ejus origine,* I, c. 9.

'"*Summa theol., Suppl.,* q. 71, a. 5.

"* *Contra Gentiles,* IV, c. 93.

Cf. Horn. 4, *In Ep. ad Ephes.*

"°Cf. St. Bernard, Serm. 1, *Super Salve Regina;* Conrad of Saxony, In *Speculo,* c. 7; Cardinal Hugo, Ad *verba Eccli.,* 24:16.

m Cf. Or. in *Zonam.*

Cf. *Opusc.,* 33, 4.

'" Cf. *Nomencl. Marianus.*

"'Cf. Or. 4, Pro *festo Visit. B. Virginis.*

Cf. Pope Leo XIII, *Octobri mense,* September 22, 1891.

""Cf. St. Ephrem, Serm. *de Ss. Dei Genitr. Virg. Mariae laudibus;* St. Bernard, Serm. 1 *super Salve Regina,*

"" *Cf. Nomencl. Marianus.*

"'*Or., In Dormit. B.M. Virg.*

"- *Fidentem piumque,* September 20, 1896.

*" *Ad/ut-icem populi,* September 5, 1895.

Cf. *Mortalium animos,* January 6, 1928.

m Cf. In *Joann.,* tr. 107.

"Cf. Maldonatus, *Comm. in Joann., c.* «7; sec also Simon, Praei. *Bibl.* I, Lib. II. P. III, a. 9.

501 Serm. 1, De Annunt. B. Virg. Mariae.

" St. Thomas, De *regim. princip.,*

"Cf. *Summa theol.,* Ia, q. 96, a. 4.

OTCf. St. Ambrose, *Expos, in Luc.* 10; Guevara, *In cap. I Matt.,* observ. >5· v- 5-

"Cf. Dieckmann, De *Ecclesia,* I, c. 2, q. 5.

M"Cf. *Summa theol.,* la Ilae, q. 98,

*" Cf. Heris, *"La royauté du Christ," Revue de Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques,* July, 1926.

"Cf. De regim. *prine.,* II, 13.

" *Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 59, a. 4, ad 1 urn.

*"Cf. St. Robert Bellarmine, *De* Rom. *Pontif.,* V, c. 4; Gregory of Valencia, Comm. *Theol.,* I, d. 1, q. *22,* punct. 6; Molina, *De Just.,* tr. 2, d. 28; Suârez, *De Incarnat.,* d. 48, sect. 2; Lugo, Dis/». 30, sect. 1.

"Cf. *Quas primas,* December 11, 1925.

"Cf. Dcnz. 831.

"· Cf. St. Peter Canisius, *De Maria Virgine incomparabili,* V, c. 10.

" Cf. *ibid.,* IV, c. 6; V, c. 3.

"* *Monita salutaria adversus cultores indiscretos,* mon. 10, xi.

" Cf. Dcnz. 784; *Ineffabilis Deus,* December 8, 1854.

sa° Jucunda semper, September 7, 1894.

«n *Ad diem illum,* Febmary 2, 1904.

" Cf. *De laud. Deiparae.*

"Cf. Horn. 1, *In Praesent.*

m Cf- Horn. 2, *In Dormit. Deiparae.*

™Cf. Horn. 1, *In dormit. B.M. Virginis.*

" *Cf.* St. Tarasius, Or. in *Deip. Praesentationem;* St. Theodorus, *Horn, in dormit. Deiparae;* St. Peter Damian, Serm. 40, *In Assumpt. B.M. Virginis;* Rupert of Deutz, In Cant.

"Cf. *Serm. in dom. infra octav. Assumpt.*

"Cf. *Mariale,* q. 165.

" Cf. Comm, in *Ps. 44.*

" *Cf.* Cone, x. *Super Missus est.*

"De Maria Virgine incomparabili, V,C. 13.

"Cf. *Specui.,* VI, in the works of St. Bonaventure.

"Cf. St. Bernard, Serm. *in Signum magnum; St.* Ildephonse, Serm. 1, De *Assumptione.*

"De *Virginitate S. Mariae,* c. 12

" Cf. De *Fide Orth., c.* 15.

" Cf. De *laud. Virginis.*

In Cant., c. 4.

"Serm. 5, De BJVf. Virgine.

" *Glories of Mary,* P. I. c. 1.

•"Cf. Peronne, De *Incarnat.,* P. II, c. 3, n. 378.

"'Cf. St. Epiphanius, De *laudibus Virginis;* St. Andrew of Crete, *Or. in Dormit. Deiparae;* Hugh of St. Victor, Serm. 46.

"Cf. *Mariale,* q. x68.

"De *Virgin..* II, c. 2.

'"*Summa theol.,* la Ilae, q. 106, a. 1.

"Cf. Dillenschneider, *Souverainite de Marie.* Doctrinal report of the Marian Congress of Boulogne sur-Mer, July, 1938.

"Cf. *Ad diem ilium,* February 2. 1904; cf. also Pope *Leo* XIII, *Ad-jutricem populi,* September 5, 1895.

"Cf. *Summa theol., Suppl.,* q. 89,

"Cf. St. Ephrcm, *Ag.,* III. 575-77; St. Bernard, *In Cant. Salve Regina.*

"Cf. St. Thomas. *Exposit. in Epist. Canonicas,* praef.; Gerson, *Super Magnificat.* P. HI, tr. 4; Gabriel Biel, *In Can. Missae,* lect. 80.

" *Op. cit.*

'' Cf. *De excell. Virg. Mariae, c.* 6.

"* *Ibid.,* c. 4.

""Cf. *Tract, de Beat. Virgine,* P. Ill,

■* Cf. *Tract. Dogm. de B.V. Deipara,* q. 1,8.4.

'' Cf. *In Prov.,* c. 8.

''Cf. De *Maria Regina,* sect. 2, c. 2,

"Cf. *Deipara clucidata,* prin. 11, sect. 6.

"Senn. 2, *In dormit. B.V. Mariae.*

m Cf. St. Albert the Great, *Mariale, rcsp.* ad qq. 26–43; Suirez, In *III,* disp. 22, sect. 2.

"Cf. *Mariologia,* III, q. 3, n. 207.

"" *Summa theol.,* la, q. 96, a. 4.

"Cf. Denz. 1782.

" Cf. *Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 13, a. 1.

"Quas *primas,* December 11, 1925.

"Cf. Ag., Ill, 528-43; Bover, *loc. cit.*

"Cf. *Serm. in Zonam.*

" *Cf. De Fide Orth.,* IV, c. 14.

" Cf. De *Virginitate Sanctae Mariae,*

"Sec St. Anselm, Or. *ad S. Virg. Mariam;* St. Bernard, *Hom.* 4 *super Missus est;* St. Bonaventure, *In III Sent.,* d. 2, a. 3, q. 3.

"Cf. Conrad of Saxony, *Specul. B.M. Virg.,* VIII.

*"Cf. *Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 13, a.

m Cf. Bartholomew de los Rios, *Ilierarchia Mariana, V,* c. 16; Gutiérrez Alonso, *La csclavitud Mariana,* P. I, c. 2, a. 7; Vega, *op. cit.,* pal. 27, cert. 1; Garau, *op. cit.,* prin. 11, no. 5; Sedlmayr, *Theol. Mariana,* 11, q. 11, a. 3.

"Cf. Vega, *op. cd.,* pal. 27, cert. 1.

"Cf. St. Thomas, De *regim. principe* III, c. 9; *Summa theol.,* la, q. 96, a. 2; Lepicier, *op. cit.,* P. Ill, c. 2, a. 1.

"Denis the Carth., De *laud. glor. Virg. Mariae,* I, a. 21.

CHAPTER FIVE

' Cf. Suarez, In III, d. 22, sect. 2.

' Canisius, De *Maria Virgine incomparabili,* I, c. 2; V, c. 11.

' Cf. Auth., "Mariology and Lutheranism," *Eccles. Rev.,* Vol. LXXX, 1929.

'Lux *veritatis,* December 25, 1931.

"Cf. Denz. 1316.

• On this last passage see Knabcnbauer. Comm, *in Luc.,* c. 1.

' Cf. St. Epiphanius, Haer., 79; St. John Damascene, *Serm. de Nativ. Virg.;* St. Bernard, Hom. 2, *Super Missus est;* St. Peter Damian, *Epist. ad Stephanum;* Fulbert of Chartres, Serm. 1, De *Nativ.* B. Virginis; Raymond Jourdain, *Contempi. de* B..M. Virg., cont. 4; St. Bernardine of Siena, Serm. 2, De Ss. *Nomine Mariae.*

* Cf. Cardinal Hosio, *Expos, salut, angelicae.*

• Cf. Diekamp, *Theol. Dogm. Manuale,* I, sect. 4, c. 2; Thomas Bocio, De signis *Eccl. Dei,* X, c. 6.

« Cf. *Haer., -j3.*

" Cf. De *Spiritu Santo,* III, c. 12.

" *In III Sent.,* dist. 22, q. 3, a. 3, ad

'"Cf. *Haer.,* 79.

"De *Genesi contra Manichaeos,* XI.

"Cf. *Ep. Dogm.,* 2.

'•*Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 25, a. 5.

" In *III Sent.,* d. 9, a. 1, q. 3.

"Cf. Serm. 2, De Visit. B. Virg. *Mariae.*

"Cf. *In Illam,* d. 100, c. 2.

" Feast of the Blessed Virgin, resp. 7, at Matins.

"Decree of June 1, 1884.

" De *Incam.,* d. 5, sect. 3, a. 1.

"De *Verb. Incarn.,* I, c. 3, a. 4, cscol.

NOTE

"Cf. St. Bonaventure, Γη III Sent., d. 9, a. 1. q. 3, ad atim.

‘‘In *Illam,* d. 22, sect. 3.

"Summo *theol.,* Illa, q. 25, a. 3.

‘‘Cf. Bernard, *Fisiologie del* cuorc; Sinibaldi, *Il cuore della Madre di* amorc. c. 3.

‘‘Cf. Lebrun, Ld *devotion au Cœur de Marie.*

" Cf. St. John Eudes, Cœur *admirable,* I, c. 5.

"Litterae decretales, May 31, 1925.

"Cf. Bourasse, *Summa Aurea, Builarium Marianum,* VII.

® Cf. Nix, *Cultus Ss. Cordis Jesu et Purissimi Cordis B.V. Mariae,* c. 6, a. 1.

" Cf. De excel/. Virg., c. 9.

" Cf. *Deprecat. ad glor. Virg. Mar-*

‘‘Cf. De *Laud. B. Mariae,* XI.

"Cf. *Contemplationes de B. Virg.,* IV, contempl. 1-3.

‘‘ Cf. Serm. 9, De *Visit. B. Virg.*

” De Maria Virg. incomp., I, c. 13.

’’ Cf. Campana, *Maria nel culto cattolico,* sec. 4, c. 3, a. 1.

‘‘ Cf. John Ferrandus, *Disquis. reliq.,* I, c. 2, a. 3; Baronius, *Annal.,* XII, a. 1123; Gentilucci, *Life of the Blessed Virgin,* trans, by Thomas Kelly (New York: 1856).

‘‘ Cf. *Maria nel culto cattolico,* II, sec. 4, c. 5, a. 2.

‘‘De *reliquiis B. Virg. Mariae,* II.

‘‘ Cf. Llor, *La Tierra Santa,* cc. 2, 3.

‘‘ Cf. Delaporte, *La Voile de Notre Dame; Camara Santa.*

“ Cf. Denz. 984-85.

" Cf. *Serm. in Zonam.*

" Cf. Jugic, *Patrol. Orient.,* XVI.

‘‘ Cf. *Summa theol.,* Illa, q. 25, a. 6.

‘‘Cf. *loc. cit.,* ad zum.

" Cf. Denz. 302.

‘‘ Cf. *ibid.,* 986.

‘‘ Cf. *ibid.,* 994.

‘‘Cf. can. 1276.

‘‘ Cf. Epist. 500.

‘‘Epist. VII, 5.

‘‘Epist. VII. 111.

‘‘ Denz. 302.

" Summo theol., Illa, q. 15, a. 3.

’’Cf. Contenson, De Inarm., X, d. 1, c. 2.

"Cf. De *Festis B.M. Virg.,* II, c. 10.

‘‘ Cf. Gutiérrez, *El culto litûrgjco de la Sant'uima Virgen, c.* 12.

• Bourasse, *Bullarium* Marwnum, VII.

‘‘Cf. Roman Breviary, Feast of the Most Holy Name of Mary, lect. 6.

‘‘Serm. 146.

‘‘Serm. *de Annunt.* B. Virg. *Mariae.*

"In *III Sent.,* d. 19, q. 3.

“ Contempl. BM. Virg., c. 5; cf. also St. Peter Canisius, De *Maria Virg. incomp., I,* c. 1.

‘‘ Cf. *Summa theol.,* la, q. 13, a. 1.

" Serm. in Zonam.

“ Cf. Speculum BM. Virg., lect. 9.

n Cf. *op. cit.,* I, c. 1.

” Loc. cit.

"Speculum BM. Virg., lect. 3.

"Cf. *In cap. 2 Luc.*

"Serm. in dom. 3 Quadrag.

"Serm. 1, *De Nomine Mariae.*

"Serm. 2, In *Dormit. Deip. Virg. Mariae.*

” Hom. da Vigil. Nativitatis.

" Hom. 2, *Super Missus est.*

" De *laud. B. Mariae, I.*

" Cf. Jourdain, *loc. cit.;* Novato, *De eminent. Deip. Virg.,* I, c. 1, q. 12; Vega, *Theol. Mariana,* P. XVIII, cert. 4; Sedlmayr, *Theol. Mariana,* P. I, q. 10, a. 5; Lepicier, *op. cit.,* P. I, c. 1.

" Cf. *Theol. Mariana, P.* I, c. 1, a. 2.

‘‘ Cf. Pcsch, *De Sacr. in genere,* app. *De Sacramentalibus.*

‘‘ Cf. *loc. cit.*

" Cf. Lahousse, De *Sacram, in genere,* app. *De Sacram.*

“ Cf. Campana, *Maria nel Dogma cattolico,* P. Ill, c. 1; Theophilus Raynaud, *Diptycha Mariana.* P. *Il,* no. 21.

” De laud. B. Mariae, I. c. a.

‘‘ Or. 6, *In Annunt.*

CHAPTER SIX

'*Magnae Dei Matris,* September 8, 1892.

'*Lux veritatis,* December 25, 1931.

* Cf. Rover, Zoe. *cit.*

'*Oral, ad Ss. Virg. Mariam, η.*

'Cf. *loc. cit.,* 8.

•*Senn, de Aquaeductu.*

'*De Virginit. S. Mariae, c.* 12.

' Cf. Denz. 984.

•Cf. *Confirm, et ampliatio indultorum ac indulgentiarum Rosarii B.M.* Virg., 1583; Bourosse, *Summa aurea,* VII.

''Cf. Ag,, III, 526-27; 532-33.

u Cf. Prec. *2, Praepar. ad Missam.*

''Cf. Horn. 2, *Super Missus est.*

''Cf. Horn. 4, De *laud. B. Virginis;* St. Basil of Selcucia, Or. 1, De *Verbi Ineam.;* St. Germanus of Constantinople, Serm. *in Zonam;* St. Anselm, Or. 3-4, Ad. S. Virg. *Mariam;* Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, *Serm. 1, In festo Assumpt. B. Mariae.*

'' Cf. Lepicier, *op. cit.,* P. III, c. 1, a. 4.

''Magnae Dei *Matris,* September 8, 1892.

" *Serm. in Zonam.*

17 Serm. 9, De *Visitat.* B. Virginis.

'' Cf. In *Cant.*

'· Cf. *Nomencl. Marianus.*

"*Serin, in Nativ.* B.M. Virginis.

" Or. 2, Ad S. Virg. *Mariam;* cf. Bittremieux, *op. cit.,* II, c. 6.

'' Cf. *op. cit.*

°* *In Joan. 8:46.*

"*Magnae Dei Matris,* September 8, 1892.

''Ad *diem illum,* February 2, 1904.

'' Ep. 22, Ad *Eustochium.*

"Cf. De Virg., II, c. 2.

" Cf. *Serm. super Salve Regina.*

''Cf. Memor., 13, cp. 25; cf. St. Ildcphonse, Serm. 1, De *Assumpt. Deiparae.*

'' Cf. Serm. 1, *In Epiph. Domini;* see also Adam, Abbot of Persenia, Serm. 5, De *Assumpt. S. Mariae.*

"*Ad diem illum,* February 2, 1904.

''Cf. *Expositio cap. 1 Ep. ad Hebraeos.*

''Cf. *op. cit.,* sect. 1, c. 2; Dechamps, Nouvelle Eve, p. 293.

''Cf. St. Ephrem, Ag., III, 543; St. Germanus, *Serm. in Zonam;* Raymond Jourdain, *Contempl. de* B. Virgine, P. IX, cont. 14; Abbot Godfried, Serm. in *omni festo B. Mariae.*

'' Avis sur *la dévotion a Marie.*

" Cf. De *festis B.M. Virginis,* II, c. 6.

CHAPTER SEVEN

1 Cf. In III *Sent.,* d. 3.

' *Augustissimae Virginis Mariae,* September 23, 1897.

'See Ad *diem illum,* February 2, 1904.

'Or. 2, In *Dormit. B. Virginis;* cf. also St. Ephrem, Ag., III, 526-27; 53ï–33·

• Serm. in *Zonam.*

'*Serm. de Aquaeductu; cf.* also Richard of St. Lawrence, De *laudib.* B. Mariae, II.

' Cf. In IV *Sent.,* d. 15, q. 4, a. 1, ad 311m.

' Cf. Vermcersch, Q. de virt. *relig. et pietatis;* Leroux, *"Necessitas orationis ad salutem," Revue Eccl. de Liège,* an. XXII, n. 4, 1931.

' Augustissimae Virginis, September 12, 1897.

••Cf. *In III, d.* 23, sect. 3.

‘‘Cf. Novato, De *eminentia Deiparae Virg· Mariae.* II. c. 12, q. 2.

’’Cf. Fcrrctti, *Institutiones Philosophiae Moralis,* II, c. 2, sect. 2, a. 1.

‘‘Cf. Carriguet, *La Vierge Marie,* III, c. 3; Ramôn, *Teologia Mariana,* III’ q. 15.

ll De corrept. et gratia, c. 7.

‘‘Cf. Council of Trent, session VI, c. 12; Denz. 805.

‘‘De *operantibus divinis,* d. 6, lect.

"Cf. Serm. 1, In *Septuag.*

‘‘ Cf. *Serm. de laud. Ss. Virg. Mariae.*

‘‘Serm. 1, De *Nativit. B. Virg.*

‘‘ De excell. Virginis, c. 4.

‘‘ Serm. de Aquaeductu.

‘‘Serm. 1, In *Purifie. B. Mariae.*

‘‘De *laud. B. Mariae,* II.

‘‘ Contempl. de B. Virg., proem.

‘‘De *triumphali Christi agone,* c. 18.

‘‘ Glories of Mary, c. 8.

" Cf. *Clypeus Theol. Thomist.,* II, tr. 5, d. 6

‘‘ Cf. De *Verbo Incam.,* c. 6, schol.

‘‘Serm, *2, In Dormit.*

"Serm. de laud. Virginis.

"Cf. d’Argentân, *Defensio B.V. Mariae et piorum cultorum illius.*

‘‘ Cf. *Glories of Mary, c.* 8.

‘‘ Cf. Dublanchy, *Dictionnaire de Théol. Cath.,* IX, coi. 2457.

‘‘Lib. de Virginitate B. Virginis, c. 4.

‘‘ Serm. 1, De *Nativit. B. Virginis.*

"Marial., serm. 2, De *Coronat. B. Virg.*

’’ Cf. Serm. 1, De *Nativit. B. Virginis,* by St. Peter Damian.

"Serm. 5, *De Assumpt. Mariae.*

" Cf. *Serm. in Purificat. S. Mariae;* see also Adam, Abbot of Persenia, Serm. 2, *In Assumpt. Mariae.*

‘‘De festis B.M. Virginis, II, c. 6.

‘‘ Cf. *La Vierge Mère d'après la Théologie, c.* 25.

‘‘ Cf. Terrien, *op. cit.,* X, c. 1.

‘‘Cf. VelAzquez, *op. cit.,* III, adn. 20.

‘‘ De *corrept. et grat., c.* 13.

‘‘ Postcommunion.

‘‘Serm. 2, *In Purifie. B Virg. Mariae.*

"Cf. Serm. 1, *De Annunt.* B. Virg. *Mariae.*

‘‘ Cf. Sedlmayr, *Theol. Mariana, P. III,* q. 12, a, 5.

"Superiore anno. August 30, 1884.

‘‘ Serm. 2, *In Praesentat. Deiparae.*

" Serm. 2, *In Dormit.*

" Horn. 8, De *laudib. B. Virginis.*

‘‘Cf. Infer *sodalitia,* March 22, 1918.

‘‘Ag.,III.

■ Serm. 1, De *Assumptione.*

"InPs.113.

"Comm. in Evang. historiam, III, tr. 5.

" Little Office of B.V.M., Compline hymn.

‘‘ Cf. loc. *cit.*

" Soliloquum, c. 1; cf. also *Expos, super Salve Regina.*

" De laud. B. Mariae, X.

"Summa, IV, tit. 15,c. 19.

‘‘ Cf. *op. cit.,* P. III, q. 12, a. 3.

‘‘ Cf. Jugie, *Theol. Dogm. Christian. Orientalium, De Novissimis,* a. 3.

"Summa theol., Illa, q. 59, a. 1.

" Cf. Stentrup, *Soteriologia,* II, c. 11; Paquet, De *Novissimis,* d. 8, a. 2.

" Cf. Suarez, In *Illam,* d. 52, sect. 2.

‘‘ Cf. *Homiliae diversae,* 14.

"Theol. Schol. Dogm.. tr. 15, q. 4.

"Adjutricem populi, September 5, 1895.

n Laetitiae sanctae. September 8. 1893.

" Cf. *Super Magnificat,* tr. 9.

"Neminem fugit, June 14, 1892.

’’Supremi apostolatus, September 1, 1883.

"Supremi apostolatus. September 1, 1883.

" Cf. Edmund Joly, *La Mère de Dieu dans la pensée, l'art et la vie,* c. 4.

CHAPTER EIGHT

1 Cf. St. Peter Canisius, *op. cit., V, c. 15.*

' *Cf.* Noyon, *"Mariolatrie,"* in D.A., fasc. 14.

* Cf. St. Theophilus, Ad *Autol.,* Ill; Tertullian, *Apol.,* c. 9.

‘Cf. St. Peter Canisius, *op. cit.,* V, c. 15.

* Cf. L'Etude *comparée des religions,* c. 10, sect. 2.

'*Contra Faustum,* c. 23.

’Cf. Ncubcrt, *Marie dans l'Eglisc Antenicéene,* conci.

'Cf. S. Alameda, *La Virgen en la Biblia y en la primitiva Iglcsia,* III, sect. 2.

* Cf. Rcnaudin, *Assumptio B. Mariae Virginis, C.* 13.

‘‘Cf. Le Hir, Etudes *bibliques,* II, sect. 3, a. 4.

u Cf. St. Ignatius, Ad *Ephes., c.* 19; St. Justin, *Dial, contra Tryph.;* St. Irenaeus, *Haer., 50;* St. Clement, *Strom.,* 7; Origen, Hom. 14, In Luc.; St. Gregory, Semi, in *Nativit. Christi.*

" Cf. St. Justin, *loc. cit.;* St. Irenaeus, Haer., 3-4; St. Hippolytus, *Contra Noeturn.*

‘‘Cf. St. Justin, *loc. cit.;* St. Irenaeus, *Haer.,* 3-5; Tertullian, De *Cam. Christi.*

’’ Cf. St. Irenaeus, Haer., 5; St. Gregory, loc. *cit.*

“Cf. Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, IX, col. 2440.

‘‘Cf. *Hom. in Dormit. B.M. Virginis.*

’’ Cf. St. Ephrem, *loc. cit.*

‘‘ Cf. St. Epiphanius, *Haer.,* 79.

“Cf. Froidevaux, "Le *symbole de Saint* Gregoire *le Thaumaturge," Recherches de Science Religieuse,* XIX, N. 3-4, 1929.

" Cf. St. Gregory Nazianzcn, Or. 17, n. 19.

" Cf. St. Ambrose, De Virgin., II, c. 2.

’’ Cf. Campana, *op. cit.,* sect. 2, c. 1, a. 7.

‘‘Cf. Tixcrant, *Histoire des Dogmes,* III, pp. 265-66.

" Cf. Pope Benedict XIV, De *festis B.M. Virg.,* II, c. 3, n. 15.

‘‘Cf. Migne, Vol. CII, col. 88-140.

‘‘Cf. Campana, *op. cit.,* sect. 2, c. 1.

"Cf. Migne, Vol. LXXXV, col. 171.

‘‘ Cf. Vol. I, pp. 30&-10.

‘‘Cf. Serm. 287.

‘‘Cf. Comm, de *dierum festorum celebratione,* II, c. 20.

" Cf. Campana, *Maria nel culto cattolico,* sect. 2, c. 1, a. 3.

‘‘ Cf. Schuster, *Liber Sacramentorum,* Vol. VIII.

‘‘ Cf. De *perpetua virginit. S. Mariae et de ejus parturitione.*

‘‘ Cf. Gutiirrcz, EI *culto liturgico de la Santisima Virgen,* p. 186. The Spaniards still preserve the custom of a sermon on Good Friday night in remembrance of our Lady in her solitude after the death of Christ.

‘‘Cf. *Summa, IV,* t. 15, c. 23; *Analecta O.F.M.,* Ill, 329.

"Cf. de Fleury, La *Sainte Vierge,* Vol. I, p. 324; Gumperberg, *Atlas Marianus.*

" Cf. St. Peter Canisius, *op. cit., V, c.* 10.

‘‘Cf. Dillenschncidcr, *op. cit.,* P. I,

NOTE

CHAPTER NINE

l Cf. Campana, *op. cit.,* sect. 4, c. 5,

8 'Cf. *De festis B.M. Virg.,* II, c. *6,*

n. 8.

•Cf. Denz. 802-06; Lepicier, De *stabilitate et progressu dogmatis,* P. II, a. 9.

'Cf. Lczama, De *Maria Patrona, c.* 5; Sylveira, *Apologia Carmelitana,* q. 27· ''· *33°.*

•Cf. *Controv.,* IV, II, De *Poenit.,* c.7.

• Cf. De *festis B.M. Virg.,* II, c. 6.

' Cf. Terrien, *op. cit.,* X, c. 1, p. 306.

• Cf. Campana, *op. cit.,* sect. 4, c. 5,

*Cf. Raynaud, *Scapulare marianum illustratum et defensum;* Besalduch, *Enciclopedia del Escapulario del Car-*

'° Cf. Papebroech, *Respons.,* I, sect. 15; Zimmerman, *Monum. Histor. Carinelit.;* Hilgers, *Catholic Encyclopedia,* XIII, "Sabbatine Privilege."

Il Cf. Besalduch, *op. cit.*

'' Cf. *Bullar. Carmelit.,* I.

''Cf. *At. Ap. Sedis,* III, 1911.

'' Cf. Act. *Ap. Sedes,* XIV, 1922.

'' Cf. *Respons.,* P. II, a. 20.

''Cf. St. Robert Bcllannine, De *Indulg.,* I, c. 17; Pope Benedict XIV, De *Synod., dioec.,* XIII, c. 18.

'' Cf. Pope Benedict XII, *Benedictus Deus;* Denz. 530; see also Denz. 693.

'' Cf. *loc. cit.*

'' *Cf. loc. cit.*

'' Cf. Pope Benedict XIV, De *festis B.M. Virg.,* c. 6.

n Cf. Launay, De *Carmelitani Scapularis sodalitio dissertatio,* c. 2.

'' Cf. Fanfani, De *Rosario B.M. Virginis, c. 1.*

° *Cf.* Rouet de Journal, *Eph. Theol. Lovan., 182,* n. *2.*

" *Cf. Rational, divin, offic.,* IV.

■ Cf. *Exposit. salut, angelicae, quam jure adseribe S. Thomae, ostendit* Rori *apud. Divus Thomas Placentinus,* XXXIV, n. 5 (1931).

'' Cf. Trombelli, De cultu *publico ab Eccles. B. Mariae exhibendo,* d. 4, c. 2, q. 2.

'' Cf. Campana, *op. cit.,* sect. 3, c. 1, a. 2; Lehemayr, Rosetum *Marianum, c.* 1.

■ Cf. Baronins, *Annal.,* an. 431.

''Cf. Trombelli, *loc. cit.*

'' Cf. Bcrliere, *"Angelique salutation," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,* I, col. 1276.

'' Cf. *De oratione et horis canonicis,* I, c. 19, π. 130.

'' Cf. Breve *doctrina y ensenanza que ha de saber y de paner par obra todo xpiano y cristiana. En la cual deben ser enseüados los moçuelos primera que en otra cosa.* Ordenôla Fray Hernando de Tolavcra, primera z\rzobispo de la Santa Yglesia de Granada.

'' Cf. Monfang, *Katholische Katechismen,* p. 16.

''Cf. Trombelli, *loc. cit.*

'' Cf. Navanus, *loc. dt.*

"Cf. Cetino, *"jFundô Santo Domingo el Rosario?"* in *Ciencia Tomista,* nn. 50, 72, 75, 78 (1921-22); Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux des Frères Prêcheurs,* Vol. 1, col. 1; Campana, *op. cit.;* Fanfani, De *Rosario BM. Virg.; Pira. Historia Mariana de Espana,* III, c. 25.

''Cf. *Analecta Juris Pontifiai,* II, col. 1379 ss.; Fanfani, *op. cit.*

"Supremi apostolatus, September 1, 1883.

"Octobri mense, September 22, 189·.

■° *Ingravescentibus malis,* September 29, 1937.

"Supremi apostolatus, September 1, 1883.

"Loc. cit.

Index

Adoption, divine, 146-47
Advocate, 158-84
Angels, and Mary's distribution of grace, 87
Angelus, 270
Annunciation, and spiritual motherhood, 152-53
Apocryphal books and Marian cult, 262-63

Blessed Virgin; *see* Mary

Causality
  exemplary, of Mary, 248
  impetratory, of Mary, 249-50
  of Mary in distribution of graces, 87-96
  types of, 88-89
Christ
  and particular judgment, 252-53
  and the Church, 118-20
  as cause of all graces, 90
  as King, 185-89
  as Lord, 198-99
  as Mediator, 73; 131-33
  as Priest, 61-63; **i
  as Redeemer, 143-44
  kingdom of, 187-88; 193
  merit of, 37-38; 57-58
  prayer of, 162
  redemption by, 8-io
  satisfaction by, 27-28; 34-36
Christian people and Marian cult, 256·

Church, 116-18; 125-26
  as mystical body, 127
  foundation of, 118-20
  Mary's assistance to, 122-23
  Mary's benefits to, 254-55
  Mary's role in, 118-29
Communion; *see* Eucharist
Compassion
  and Mary's queenship, 197
  and power of prayer, 168
  and redemption, 15-24
Compassion *(continued)*
  consummation of spiritual motherhood, 152-56
  merit of, 55
  redemptive value of, 68-71
  satisfactory aspect of, 29-30
Consort, and Marian cult, 261-62; in redemption, 1-4
Cooperation, Mary's
  in distribution of graces, 73-82
  in foundation of Church, 118-20
  in objective redemption, 7-71
  in redemption, 1-4
  in subjective redemption, 72-129
  meritorious aspect of, 36-58
  redemptive aspect of, 68-71
  sacrificial aspect of, 58-68
  satisfactory aspect of, 25-36
  with the Church, 125-29
Co-rcdeemers, 145-46
Co redemptrix, 138-45; 210
Cult, 203-4; *see also* Devotion; Veneration
  Marian, and pagan cult, 260-61
  of honor, 229-30
  of imitation, 236-39
  of invocation, 232-36
  of love, 230-32

Devotion
  antiquity of Marian, 262-71
  benefits of Marian, 248-58
  necessity of Marian, for salvation, 240-42
  origin of Marian, 259-62
  practices of Marian, 272-85
  to Immaculate Heart. 211-15
  to Marian Scapular, 271-77
  to Mary, and predestination, 343-
  to itosary, 277-85
  to Sacred Heart, 211
Dispenser *of* all graces, 73-129; *Men's* causality as, 87-96; *see* Church; Eucharist; Mary; Mass; Sacraments
Dominic, St., and Rosary, 281-83

Dominion. Mary's, aoo-aoa
Dolia, 103-4; 109-10

Eucharist, roo
duration of. in Mary, 109-11
Mary's influence on reception of, 106-9
Mary's intervention in institution of, 100-106
Mary's reception of, 10611
Eve and Mary, 3

Family, Holy, 255-56; Mary's influence on, 255-56
Fathers, Church, and Marian cult, 263·66
Feast
of Mary's Nativity, 268-69
of the Annunciation, 267-68
of the Assumption, 268
of the Betrothal, 269
of the Dormition, 268
of the Glorious Mother, 265-66
of the Holy Virgin, 265-66
of the Immaculate Conception, 269
of the Purification, 266-67
of the Seven Dolors, 269-70
of the Visitation, 269

Grace, 97; sacramental, 98100
Graces. Mary's distribution of, 72-129; of the Eucharist. 100-116; of the sacraments, 97-100

Heart, devotion to Immaculate, 211-15; devotion to Sacred, 211
Hell, souls in, and Mary's prayer, 174-79
Heretics, Marys intercession for, 182
Heroic act of charity, 172-74
Hyperdulia, 203-4; 20°»o; 218-19; 222-23; «5

Images of Mary, veneration of, 220-23
Immolation, 60-61
Incarnation, and Marian cult, 262-63; Mary's consent to, 12-15
Indulgences, and souls in purgatory, »73'74
Intercession
Mary's, and souls in hell, 174-79
Mary's, as advocate, 159-84
Mary's, as dispenser of graces, 88; 91-92
Intercession *(continued)*
Mary's, for souls in purgatory, 170·
Maq?s, for souls on earth, 161-63; 168 69; »79 84
of Mary and the saints. 169-70
Intervention, Mary's, in distribution of graces, 83-96

Justification, and Mary's merit, 50-51

King, 184-85; Christ as, 185-89
Kingdom, Christ's, 186-88; Mary's power in, 193-96

Lady, our, 198-202
Latria, 203-4; 2°6'9
Lord, 198

Mary
and Christian people, 256-57
and consent to Incarnation, 1215
and cooperation in redemption, 1-129
and distribution of graces, 72-129
and Eve, 3
and explicit cooperation in redemption, 12-15
and formal cooperation in redemption, 12-15
and merit, 36-58
and objective redemption, 7-71
and particular judgment, 251-54
and perseverance, 52
and physical cooperation in redemption, 10-12
and predestination, 52-54; 2^3-47
and proximate cooperation in redemption, 15-24
and remote cooperation in redemption, 10-12
and sacrifice, 56-58
and satisfaction, 25-36
and society, 257-58
and subjective redemption, 72-129
and the Church, 116-29; 254-55
and the Eucharist, 100-11
and the family, 255-56
and the Mass, 111-16
and the sacraments, 07·100
and unity of the Cnurch, 116-29; *54'55
as advocate, 158-84
as co-rcdcmptrix, 138-45

Mary *(continued)*
as exemplary cause, 248
as impetratory cause, 249-50
as mediatrix, 135-57
as mistress of universe, 198-202
as Mother of men, 146-57
as our Lady, 198-202
as patroness, 158-84
as priest, 66-68
as queen, 184-97
cooperation of, in redemption, i-6
intercession of, 161-84
maternity of, and redemption, 4-6
prayer of, 161-84
redemption of, 25-24
spiritual motherhood of, 146-57
veneration of, 205-71
Mass, 111; distribution of fruits of, 114-16; Mary's intervention in, 111-16
Maternity, divine,
and distribution of graces, 81
and Marian cult, 210; 261-62
and Mary's dominion, 200-202
and Maiy's intercession, 92
and Mary's queenship, 196-97
and power of prayer, 167-68
and sanctity of Mary, 25
of Mary and redemption, 4-6
Maternit), spiritual; *see* Motherhood, spiritual
Mediation, 130 22; 137.38; Christ's, μ VV'' Ma[T. *?J37: ,j8
Mediator; see Mediation
Mediatrix; see Mary; Mediation
Merit
Christ's, 37-38
de condigno, yj
de congruo, 37; Mary's, 43-49
excellence of Mary's, 54-57
extent of Mary's, 49-54
imperative, 37
in general, 36
Mary's, and graces for men, 50-52
Mary's, and justification, 50-51
Mary's, and merit of the saints, 57-58
Mary's, and remission of sin, 50
Mary's, compared to Christ's, 57-58
Mary's, in redemption, 36-58
of Christ, and Mary's gifts, 23-24
of Mary's compassion, 55
Mistress of the universe, 198-202
Mother of men; see Motherhood, spiritual
Motherhood, spiritual, 81 82; 146-57: extension of, 156-57
Mystical body; *tee* Christ

Name of Mary, 223-28

Oblation, 60 61; of Christ by Mary, 63-

Old Law, and distribution of graces. 84-87

Particular judgment, Mary's intervention in, 251-54; role of Christ in, a5''53
Patroness, 158-84
Perseverance, and Mary's merit, 52
Power
Christ's judiciary, 189
Christ's legislative, 188-89
Christ's royal, 185 88
Christ's temporal, 188
Mary's regal, 193-96
titles of Mary's regal, 196-97
Prayer
Mary's, and saints, 169-70
Mary's, and souls in hell, 174-79
Mary's, for souls in purgatory, 170-

Mar/s, for us, 161-63; '68-69; 179·84
of Christ for us, 162
power of Mary's, 163-68
Predestination, and devotion to Mary, 243-47; and Mary's merit, 52-54
Priest, and sacrifice, 61; Christ as, 61-63; 67; Mary as, 66-68
Priesthood
of Christ. 61-63; 67
of Mary. 61-63; *67*
sacramental, 67
spiritual. 67
substantial, 67

Queen. 82; 184-97; 210

Redemption
and Marian cult. 261-62
Christ's role in, 8-10
in general, 1-6
Mary's consent to, 12-15
Mary's cooperation in subjective, 72-129
Mary's explicit cooperation in, is-

Redemption *(continued)*
Mary's formal cooperation in, 12-15; 68-71
Mary's merit in, 36-58
Mary's physical cooperation in, 10·
Mary's proximate cooperation in, 15-24
Mary's remote cooperation in, io-
objective, 7
of Mapl, 23-24
sacrificial aspect of Mary's cooperation in, 58-68
satisfactory aspect of Mary's cooperation in, 25-36
subjective, 7
Relics of Mary, 215-19
Rosary, excellence of, 283-85; nature of, 278-81; origin of, 281-83

Sacramentels, 227
Sacraments, 97-98; 226-27; Mary's intervention in, 98-100
Sacrifice, 58-61; Mary's role in, 63-66; of Christ, 61
Salvation, necessity of Marian devotion for, 240-42
Satisfaction
by the just, 35-36
by Christ, 27-28
de condigno, 25-26
de congruo, 26
excellence of Mary's, 33-34
extent of Mary's, 32-33
for venial sin, 35
in general, 25-26
Mary's, in redemption, 25-36
Mary's, through her compassion, 29-30
Satisfaction *(continued)*
of Mary and of Christ, 34-36
strict, 25
type of Mary's, 30-32
Scapular, origin of, 272-73; privileges of, 273-77
Schismatics, Marys intercession for, 182
Senses of Scripture, 149-50
Sin, remission of, through Mary, 50
Sinners, Mary's intercession for, 180·82
Society, and benefits of Marian devotion, 257-58
Souls in purgatory, and Mary's prayer, 170-74
Suffering, eternal, alleviation of, 176-
Suppîication, Mary's omnipotent, 165

Unity of the Church, Mary's role in, 127-28

Veneration, 203-4
antiquity of Marian, 262-71
benefits of Marian, 248-58
characteristics of Marian, 229-39
lawfulness of Marian, 204-6
motive of Marian, 209-10
necessity of Marian, 241-47
of images of Mary, 220-23
of Immaculate Heart, 211-15
of name of Mary, 223-28
of relics of Mary, 215-19
origin of Marian, 259-62
type of Marian, 209-10
Vow to Mary, 173-74

Wayfarers, Mary's prayers for, 179-82